New aspects and strategies for methane mitigation from ruminants

Kumar, Sanjay; Choudhury, Prasanta Kumar; Dolores Carro, Maria; Griffith, Gareth Wyn; Dagar, Sumit Singh; Puniya, Monica; Calabro, Serena; Ravella, Sreenivas Rao; Dhewa, Tejpal; Upadhyay, Ramesh Chandra; Sirohi, Sunil Kumar; Kundu, Shivlal Singh; Wanapat, Metha; Puniya, Anil Kumar

Published in:
Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology

DOI:
10.1007/s00253-013-5365-0

Publication date:
2014

Citation for published version (APA):
Kumar, S., Choudhury, P. K., Dolores Carro, M., Griffith, G. W., Dagar, S. S., Puniya, M., Calabro, S., Ravella, S. R., Dhewa, T., Upadhyay, R. C., Sirohi, S. K., Kundu, S. S., Wanapat, M., & Puniya, A. K. (2014). New aspects and strategies for methane mitigation from ruminants. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *98*(1), 31-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-013-5365-0

New aspects and strategies for methane mitigation from ruminants

Sanjay Kumar[a,i], Prasanta Kumar Choudhury[a], Maria Dolores Carro[d], Gareth Wyn Griffith[e], Sumit Singh Dagar[a], Monica Puniya[a], Serena Calabro[f], Sreenivas Rao Ravella[e], Tejpal Dhewa[g], Ramesh Chandra Upadhyay[b], Sunil Kumar Sirohi[c], Shivlal Singh Kundu[c] Metha Wanapat[h] and Anil Kumar Puniya[a*]

[a]Dairy Microbiology Division; [b]Dairy Cattle Physiology Division, [c]Dairy Cattle Nutrition, National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal - 132001, India

[d]Departamento de Producción Animal, ETSI Agrónomos, Ciudad Universitaria, s/n, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain

[e]Institute of Biological, Environmental and Rural Sciences, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3DD, UK

[f]Department of Animal Science and Food Control, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Napoli Federico II, via F. Delpino 1, 80137 Napoli, Italy

[g]Department of Microbiology, Bhaskarcharya College of Applied Sciences, University of Delhi, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075, India

[h]Tropical Feed Resources Research and Development Center, Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen 40002, Thailand

[i]Biological Resource Center, Korea Research Institute of Bioscience and Biotechnology, Daejeon-305-806, Korea

[*]Corresponding author: akpuniya@gmail.com

Abstract

The growing demand for sustainable animal production is compelling researchers to explore the potential approaches to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from livestock that are mainly produced by enteric fermentation. Some potential solutions for instance, the use of chemical inhibitors to reduce methanogenesis are not feasible in routine use due to their toxicity to ruminants, inhibition of efficient rumen function or other transitory effects. Strategies, such as use of plant secondary metabolites and dietary manipulations have emerged to reduce the methane emission, but these still require extensive research before these can be recommended and deployed in the livestock industry sector. Furthermore, immunization vaccines for methanogens and phages are also under investigation for mitigation of enteric methanogenesis. The increasing knowledge of methanogenic diversity in rumen, DNA sequencing technologies and bioinformatics have paved the way for chemogenomic strategies by targeting methane producers. Chemogenomics will help in finding target enzymes and proteins, which will further assist in the screening of natural as well chemical inhibitors. The construction of a methanogenic gene catalogue through these approaches is an attainable objective. This will lead to understand the microbiome function, its relation with the host and feeds, and therefore, will form the basis of practically viable and eco-friendly methane mitigation approaches, while improving the ruminant productivity.

Keywords: Rumen; Methane Mitigation; Enteric Fermentation; Methanogens, Ruminants

Introduction

Greenhouse gas (GHGs) emission from ruminant production systems is of particular interest because of their consequences in changing the global climate. Methane comprises up to 16% of global GHGs emissions (Scheehle and Kruger 2006), and is mainly detrimental, as its warming potential is nearly 25 times greater than that of CO_2 (Zhou et al. 2011). Methane emissions from the agriculture sector represents 40% of total anthropogenic production (Key and Tallard, 2012), while enteric fermentation in ruminants makes the largest single (25%) contribution (Thorpe 2009). The emission of methane from ruminants also varies based on the geographical location (FAO 2010), feed composition and quality, feed intake, processing of feed and animal breed (Hook et al. 2010).

Apart from environmental issues, the methane emission also accounts for a 2 to 12% loss of ingested energy from the rumen (Moss et al. 2000). Such considerations have led to increased efforts in identification of newer and more effective practices to mitigate methane emissions from ruminants. Advances in understanding the gut microbial communities through genomics (Leahy et al. 2010, 2013; Attwood et al. 2011) and metagenomics (Brulc et al. 2009; Hess et al. 2011; Morgavi et al. 2013) have opened novel insights about the function of rumen ecosystem. This increased knowledge has also permitted the development of mitigation strategies to target the dominant methanogenic species directly. There have been reviews of methane abatement in recent times (Moss et al. 2000; Beauchemin et al. 2008; McAllister and Newbold 2008; Kumar et al. 2009; Eckard et al. 2010; Hook et al. 2010; Martin et al. 2010; Patra 2012; Wanapat et al. 2012), so this article will focus on the latest developments (phage

68 therapy, immunization, chemogenomics approaches), possible future directions and
69 challenges in mitigating enteric methane emissions from ruminants.

70 **Mechanism of enteric methane production**

71 Enteric methane (nearly 87%) is produced in rumen, the remainder being released from
72 fermentation in the large intestine (Lascano and Cardenas 2010). Although many factors
73 influence methane emissions from ruminants, the three major determinants are level of
74 feed intake, type of carbohydrate fed, and manipulation of rumen microflora (Johnson
75 and Johnson 1995). In rumen, the network of microbes act on feed particles to degrade
76 plant polysaccharide and produce volatile fatty acids (VFAs; mainly acetate, propionate
77 and butyrate) and gases (CO_2 and H_2) as main end products. The activity of hydrogen-
78 utilizing methanogens in rumen reduces the end product inhibition of hydrogen, thereby
79 allowing more rapid fermentation of feed. Even a small amount of hydrogen in rumen
80 can limit the oxidation of sugar, VFAs conversion and hydrogenase activity, if
81 alternative pathways for disposal are absent (McAllister and Newbold 2008). Two
82 methods utilized for disposal of reducing equivalents are the production of more highly
83 reduced VFAs and hydrogen by membrane-bound hydrogenases. However, these
84 hydrogenases have an acute sensitivity to an increased partial pressure of hydrogen
85 (Russell 2002).

86 Methane production in rumen is also affected by the passage rate of digesta in the
87 gastrointestinal tract. The rumen residence time decreases with increased feed intake,
88 thus reducing the extent of the rumen fermentation and shifting digestion from the
89 rumen to the small intestine (Aluwong et al. 2011). As a consequence, methane
90 production per unit of dry matter ingested declines, as feed intake increases

(Beauchemin and McGinn 2006a), although the total amount of methane produced is higher.

Strategies to reduce enteric methane emission

The strategies to reduce methane emission from enteric fermentation are classified into different categories and their respective mechanisms of action, problems associated with each and future prospects are shown in Table 1. The two main areas of intervention that will be reviewed here are the changes in the diet and the direct manipulation of the rumen ecosystem.

Dietary changes

Although there are many approaches to reduce methane formation in the rumen, only some of those that have been more intensively investigated during the last years will be treated here, including changes in nutrient composition, plant secondary compounds, lipid supplementation, organic acids and halogenated compounds. Other options, such as the use of ionophores, probiotics, acetogens and defaunation are listed in Table 1, but these are not described here.

Changing nutrient composition

By manipulating the nutrient composition of ruminants' diet, it is possible to reduce the enteric methane yield, the forage: concentrate ratio in the diet being one of the most studied dietary factors. A high proportion of concentrate in diet reduces rumen pH and consequently affects the protozoa population (Kumar et al. 2013a, b). Furthermore, it also reduces the acetate: propionate ratio and thus decreases the amount of methane produced per unit of feed intake (Beauchemin et al. 2008). However, the proportion of concentrates needed to bring about this effect may well be over 90% of the diet and such high levels are not desirable due to health concerns (i.e., acidosis, laminitis, liver

115 abscesses etc.; Gandra et al. 2012). Moreover, feeding high amounts of concentrates is
116 not always possible in the developing countries because of the economic constraints.
117 Therefore, developing newer forages having high soluble carbohydrates can be a better
118 option for reducing methane than feeding high-concentrate based diets. Niderkorn et al.
119 (2011) reported that diets rich in certain grass varieties such as AberAvon (*Lolium*
120 *perenne*) lead to significantly reduced methane production from *in vitro* fermentations
121 than AberStar and AberMagic under the category of water soluble carbohydrates
122 forages. Similarly, different grass and shrub species, such as *L. perenne* (Ludemann et
123 al. 2013) *Gliricidia sepium*, *Brachiaria ruziziensis* (Meale et al. 2012) and *Acacia*
124 *mangium* (Giraldo et al. 2007a), were able to reduce methane emissions. Therefore,
125 grazing on these species has been proposed as a strategy to reduce methane emissions.
126 Another approach would be the selection of better quality forages (low fibre and high
127 soluble carbohydrates content), as increased quality should result in greater productivity
128 at equivalent levels of intake and methane emissions (Clark et al. 2011).

129 ***Plants containing secondary compounds***

130 Tannins, phenolic monomers and other plant secondary metabolites are toxic to ciliate
131 protozoa, fibrolytic bacteria and methanogenic archaea, and thus may help in reducing
132 methanogenesis (Goel et al. 2005; Bhatta et al. 2009; Patra and Saxena, 2009a,b;
133 Jayanegara et al. 2011). It has been observed that condensed tannins (CT) containing
134 temperate and tropical legumes reduce methanogenesis (Lascano and Cárdenas 2010;
135 Guglielmelli et al. 2011; Calabrò et al. 2012; Cieslak et al. 2013). Tiemann et al. (2008)
136 indicated that some tropical feeds with tannins have lower fibre digestibility and
137 consequently, low hydrogen production and methane emissions. Moreover, binding of
138 tannins to proteins also reduces degradation of plant protein in the rumen and lowers

139 methanogenesis (Tavendale et al. 2005). The effects of tannin content of four different
140 vegetative stages of *Onobrychis viciifolia* were evaluated by Guglielmelli et al. (2011),
141 who found a negative correlation bordering on significance (r = -0.932; P = 0.068)
142 between CTs content and methane production, indicating that methane production
143 consistently declined as the CT content increased. The methane suppression effect of
144 CT containing legumes, such as *Lotus pedunculatus* or *Acacia mearnsii,* relative to
145 forages without tannins has been shown in sheep (Carulla et al. 2005; Ramirez-Restrepo
146 and Barry 2005), Holstein cows (Woodward et al. 2001) and goats (Hess et al. 2006;
147 Animut et al. 2008). The mechanism to decrease methanogenesis seems to vary with the
148 nature of CT, as Bhatta et al. (2013) observed that *Ficus bengalensis* and *Autocarous*
149 *integrifolis* reduced methane production due to defaunation, but *Azadirachta indica*
150 reduced methanogenesis by a direct effect on methanogens. Overall, it seems that the
151 effects of CT on rumen methanogenesis depend on the structure and concentration of
152 CT.

153 ***Supplementation of lipids***

154 Vegetables and animal lipids are originally used in ruminant rations to increase their
155 energy density. These are also considered useful in terms of reduced rumen
156 methanogenesis (Soliva et al. 2004; Beauchemin et al. 2007; Brask et al. 2013).
157 Methane production has been consistently reduced by adding fat or fatty acids to
158 ruminant diets, and it is estimated that fat can reduce methane emissions by 4-5% (g/Kg
159 DMI) for every 1% increase in the fat content of the diet (Grainger and Beauchemin,
160 2011). However, the inclusion of lipids at levels above 6-7% of dry matter intake can
161 reduce feed intake and fiber digestibility, resulting in lower milk yield or daily gain
162 (Patra 2012).

163 The addition of different oils (soya, coconut, canola, rapeseed, etc.) to ruminant diets
164 have been shown to reduce methane production between 19 and 62% in Rusitec
165 fermenters (Dohme et al. 2000), sheep (Ding et al. 2012), beef cattle (Machmüller and
166 Kreuzer, 1999; Jordan et al 2006a b) and dairy cows (Odongo et al. 2007; Brask et al.
167 2013). The mechanism of methane inhibition by fat is likely to be a combination of bio-
168 hydrogenation of unsaturated fatty acids and direct inhibition of activities of different
169 microbes including methanogens (Beauchemin et al. 2007; Kong et al. 2010; Hook et al.
170 2010). Bio-hydrogenation acts as hydrogen sink and therefore decrease rumen
171 methanogenesis, but is not the only mechanisms as there is no direct link between the
172 methane reduction and the level of unsaturation (Dohme et al. 2000) or the length of the
173 fatty acid. Medium-chain fatty acids may also reduce methanogenesis by directly acting
174 on protozoa and/or methanogens. Thus, coconut oil decreased methane production and
175 methanogens in both faunated and defaunated Rusitec fermenters, the inhibition of
176 methanogenesis caused by coconut oil being similar to that produced by defaunation
177 (Dohme et al. 1999). Comparison of the effects of different fatty acids revealed that
178 lauric, myristic and linoleic acids were the most potent reducers of methanogenesis
179 (Dohme et al. 2001; Jordan et al. 2006b; Ding et al. 2012), and the ability of lauric acid
180 to decrease cell viability of M*ethanobrevibacter ruminantium* has been recently
181 reported by Zhou et al. (2013).
182 In summary, increasing the dietary proportion of lipids may provide another feeding
183 strategy for reducing rumen methanogenesis, but the appropriate lipid and dose for each
184 dietary condition should be carefully chosen, as it has been shown that different lipid
185 sources may have similar effects on methane production but variable effects on diet
186 intake and digestion (Beauchemin et al. 2007). In the last years, the potential of

187 essential oils as additives to manipulate rumen fermentation and decrease methane
188 emissions has been extensively investigated and reviewed (Calsamiglia et al. 2007;
189 Benchaar and Greathead, 2011; Bodas et al. 2012). A wide range of essential oils
190 (derived from garlic, thyme, oregano, cinnamon, rhubarb, frangula, etc.) has been
191 shown to decrease methane production *in vitro* in a dose dependent manner, but at high
192 doses the decrease in methanogenesis was accompanied by adverse effects on
193 fermentation such as reduction in VFA production and feed digestibility (Busquet et al.,
194 2005; Patra and Yu, 2012). When used at low doses (≤300 mg/l), garlic oil and its
195 organosulfur compounds consistently decreased methane production *in vitro* without
196 negatively affecting feed fermentation (Busquet et al. 2005; Kamel et al. 2008;
197 Kongmun et al. 2010; Mateos et al. 2013), but no effects of garlic oil or its compounds
198 on methanogenesis have been observed in lactating cows (van Zijderveld et al. 2011),
199 sheep (Patra et al. 2011) or fattening bulls (Staerfl et al. 2012). The lack of response *in*
200 *vivo* is partly attributed to the adaptation of microbes (Bodas et al. 2012), but also to the
201 use of lower doses compared to those in the *in vitro* experiments. The challenge now is
202 to identify essential oils that selectively inhibit methanogenesis at concentrations that
203 can be used in the practice, with lasting effects and without depressing feed digestion
204 and animal productivity (Benchaar and Greathead, 2011).

205 ***Addition of organic acids***

206 Inclusion of organic acids (i.e. malic and fumaric) or their sodium salts in diets, results
207 in shifting rumen fermentation towards propionate and hence, less methane production.
208 The addition of sodium fumarate consistently decreased methane production *in vitro* by
209 2.3 to 41% (Ungerfeld et al. 2007), and increased feed digestibility and VFAs
210 production (García-Martínez et al. 2005; Giraldo et al. 2007b). Similarly, malate, that is

converted to fumarate in the rumen, stimulated propionate formation and also inhibited methanogenesis in some *in vitro* studies (Carro and Ranilla 2003a; Tejido et al. 2005), although other studies have failed to find clear reductions of methanogenesis *in vitro* (Carro et al. 1999; Gómez et al. 2005; Ungerfeld and Forster 2011). *In vivo* effects of adding organic acids to the diet on methane mitigation are quite variable. Wood et al. (2009) noted 60 to 76% reductions in methane emissions by supplementing fumarate at 100 g/kg to growing lambs, while Foley et al. (2009a) observed the reductions of only 6 and 16%, when the diet of beef heifers was supplemented with malic acid at 37.5 and 75 g/kg, respectively. In contrast, no effects of fumaric or malic acid on methane emissions were observed in other studies (Beauchemin and McGinn 2006b; Foley et al. 2009b).

The effect of organic acids supplementation on methane reduction appears to be influenced by the forage to concentrate ratio and the type of cereal grain being fed in diet (Carro and Ranilla 2003a, b; Gómez et al. 2005; Tejido et al. 2005), although the number of studies conducted with different diets is too low to draw definitive conclusions. However, the high cost of purified organic acids makes supplementation of ruminant diets uneconomical at the doses required to be effective. Nevertheless, diet supplementation with plant tissues naturally rich in organic acids does have some potential and it may be possible to select forages with elevated levels of other acids. Studies on lucerne, Bermuda grass and tall fescue indicated that organic acids concentrations vary not only among species but also among cultivars of the same species (Callaway et al. 1997), although it is difficult to conclude whether differences in organic acid levels among forages and cultivars are sufficient enough to affect rumen methane emission. Overall, results of fumaric and malic acid supplementation *in vitro*

234 and *in vivo* are heterogeneous, and the effectiveness of these additives seem to depend
235 on their dose and nature of diet.

236 ***Use of halogenated compounds***

237 Halogenated methane analogues, such as chloral hydrate, amichloral,
238 bromochloromethane, nitroethane and 2-nitropropanol, are potential inhibitors of
239 methane in ruminants (Nevel and Demeyer 1995). Bromochloromethane can inhibit
240 methanogenesis by reacting with coenzyme B, which functions at the last step of the
241 methanogenic pathway (McCrabb et al. 1997). Recently, Abecia et al. (2012) confirmed
242 the methane reducing effects of bromochloromethane in lactating dairy goats and
243 reported a 33% reduction with no effect on rumen bacteria, protozoa and methanogens.
244 In contrast, Denman et al. (2007) reported that bromochloromethane decreased the
245 number of methanogenic archaea in the rumen of cattle by 34% and reduced methane
246 emission by 30%. Bromochloromethane is highly volatile but can be stabilized with
247 cyclodextrin resulting in more effective reduction of enteric methane emission (May et
248 al. 1995). When fed to Braham cattle at hourly intervals, it prevented all methane
249 production (McCrabb et al. 1997) and when fed twice daily to cattle for 8 weeks, it not
250 only reduced methane by 54% but also reduced feed intake. Some compounds, such a
251 bromine analogue of coenzyme M were potent methane inhibitors in *in vitro* (Martin
252 and Macy 1985), but the inhibition was not persistent *in vivo*, suggesting adaptation of
253 methanogenic populations (Nevel and Demeyer 1995). An adaptation of methanogens
254 to quaternary ammonium compounds has also been demonstrated (Tezel et al. 2006),
255 but in contrast, no adaptation has been observed for chloroform, which decreased rumen
256 methanogenesis and methanogens without altering rumen function over a 42 day period
257 (Knight et al. 2011).

258 More recently, the effect of 3-nitrooxypropanol and ethyl-3-nitrooxypropanol on rumen
259 fermentation and methane emission have been studied using Rusitec fermenters and in
260 *in vivo* trials (Haisan et al. 2013; Martinez-Fernandez et al. 2013; Perez et al. 2013).
261 Both additives showed promising potential as methane inhibitors in the rumen with no
262 negative effects on rumen fermentation. Differences among methanogens regarding
263 their resistance to chemical inhibitors should be considered, when designing strategies
264 for inhibition of rumen methanogenesis, as selection of resistant species may result
265 (Ungerfeld et al. 2004).
266 In summary, although dietary manipulation provides many viable options, there are
267 significant variations in the effectiveness of these and currently there is not yet an
268 approach that could be practically applied. Hence, there is a need to study the influence
269 of plant components and essential oils on methane production in detail with
270 standardized samples. Based on the limited information, it can be said that benefits
271 associated with bioactive compounds *in vitro* do not always mimic *in vivo,* and *in vivo*
272 effects are usually transient in nature due to microbial adaptation. Moreover, the
273 different experimental conditions found *in vitro* and *in vivo* should be taken into account
274 when comparing doses and results from experiments. Rumen dry matter content can
275 vary with several factors, ranging from 10 to 25%, whereas dry matter content in most
276 *in vitro* systems is usually much lower (Carro et al. 2006); therefore, doses are not
277 directly comparable when expressed per diet dry matter. In addition, as pointed out by
278 Beauchemin et al. (2008), most studies on reductions in methane production from
279 ruminants due to diet management are short-term and focussed only on enteric
280 emissions, but future research should investigate long-term impacts on methane
281 emissions in the whole farm.

Microbial interventions

This section deals with the diversity of methanogens in rumen and also discusses the strategies such as usage of phages and vaccination that directly target methanogens and/ or their activities.

Methanogenic diversity

In order to target methanogens, knowledge of their population dynamics, physiology and diversity in the rumen is of utmost importance. Until recently, the rumen methanogens belonged to a few genera of the orders *Methanobacteriales*, *Methanomicrobiales* and *Methanosarcinales*, within the phylum Euryarchaeota. However, based on 16S rRNA gene sequences, a novel group distantly related to the *Thermoplasmatales* (named as rumen Cluster C; previously described as rice cluster C Thermoplasmata) was found to be highly abundant in ruminants (Jannsen and Kirs, 2008; Poulsen et al. 2013).

Methanobrevibacter is the most commonly encountered genus within *Methanobacteriales,* whereas *Methanobacterium,* that shares similar physiology as *Methanobrevibacter*, are rarely reported from rumen. Other *Methanobrevibacter* members of the order *Methanomicrobiales* have been also reported to be dominant in the rumen of buffalo (Tajima et al. 2001; Shin et al. 2004). In genus *Methanomicrobium*, *M. mobile* is mostly reported (Kumar et al. 2012) from ruminants, while other members of this genus had shown an abundance with culture independent methods, but are rarely detected/isolated with conventional approaches. The order *Methanosarcinales* comprises a group of physiologically distinct aceticlastic methanogens (Janssen, 2010), but their abundance in the rumen is low. Within this

group, *Methanococcus* spp. and *Methanosarcina* spp. are the most commonly reported (Wedlock et al. 2013).

Apart from the microbial diversity analysis, functional and sequence based metagenomics have been evolved to uncover the diversity of enzymes and metabolic pathways in the rumen. This technique has been used to identify hydrolytic enzymes of industrial applications, particularly involved in plant polysaccharide degradation. Some researchers have employed this technique and identified enzymes from the rumen of cow, buffalo, camel, reindeer and yak (Zhao et al. 2010; Hess et al. 2011, Pope et al. 2012; Dai et al. 2012; Bhatt et al. 2013). This practice is based on the availability of suitable bioassays for the enzyme of interest and presently cellulose and hemicelluloses degradation is an area of interest for rumen microbiologists. Beside enzyme bioassays, heterologous complementation of host strains and mutants as well as induction of reporter genes are used for functional metagenomic screening (Leahy et al. 2013). Pope et al. (2010) reported unique bacterial lineages underpinning plant biomass conversion, and their distinct repertoire of glycoside hydrolases in Australian macropods. They also reported the abundance of polysaccharide utilization loci in Svalbard reindeer rumen micrbome, which is much similar to the microbiome of human gut (Pope et al. 2012). Similarly, Bhatt et al. (2013) highlighted the striking similarities and differences of dromedary camel *(Camelus dromedaries*) with other animal rumen ecosystem. Since, variations of microbial communities in ruminants is of great concern, Ross et al. (2012) suggested untargeted massive parallel sequencing (sequencing without target amplification of genes) approach for resolution of variation based rumen metagenome profiling.

328 Many developments in the exploration of gut microbial communities in different animal
329 species have been made through sequence based metagenomics, and some recent
330 examples follow. Dai et al. (2012) analyzed the fibrolytic microbiome in the rumen of
331 yaks, and Brulc et al. (2009) used large sequence based studies to catalogue the genes
332 involved in fiber degradation in the bovine rumen. Qi et al. (2011) applied
333 metatranscriptomics to the study of rumen microbes function in muskox, and similar
334 work has been carried out in sheep (Cammack et al. 2013), goats (Jakhesara et al. 2010)
335 and Surti buffaloes (Singh et al. 2012a). Singh et al. (2012b) studied the virulence
336 associated and antibiotic resistance genes of rumen microbes to facilitate the
337 understanding of resistant gene transfer between and within habitats. However,
338 researchers in this area have to explore the sequence based metagenomic into taxonomic
339 perspective, as well as to link genomics and metagenomics to nutrition or other animal
340 production parameters. For example, Li et al. (2012) characterized rumen microbiota of
341 pre-ruminant calves and their metabolic potential so that the optimal early weaning
342 nutritional strategies (like milk replacer) could be formulated, and recently Ross et al.
343 (2013) analyzed the effect of methane mitigating diets on rumen microbiome.

344 ***Phage therapy***

345 The lytic potential of phages and their genes make them an important tool for methane
346 mitigation strategies. In contrast to nearly 300 phage genomes (Ackermann and
347 Kropinski 2007), only six archaeal phages are sequenced and described, and just three
348 of them are from methanogens: *Methanobacterium* phage psi M1, M2 and M100
349 (Pfister et al. 1998) and *Methanothermobacter* phage psi M100 (Luo et al. 2001). Little
350 information is currently available on the genetic blueprint and gene functionality of
351 archaeal, particularly methanogenic, phages but more are being discovered using

352 electron microscopy (Ackermann 2007) and *in vitro* techniques (Stanton 2007).
353 McAllister and Newbold (2008) reported siphophages that can infect methanogens
354 (*Methanobacter*, *Methanobrevibacter* and *Methanococcus* spp.), although these phages
355 have not been isolated from the rumen. A recent metagenomic study on phage-bacterial
356 relationships showed ≤ 0.1% relative abundance of prophage in phylum *Euryarchaeota*
357 (Berg Miller et al. 2012).
358 Metagenomic surveys are expected to reveal the presence of embedded prophages and
359 phage-like elements that would have otherwise remain unnoticed. An unanticipated
360 outcome from sequencing the *M. ruminantium* genome was the discovery of prophage
361 φ-mru having 69 phage-related proteins (Leahy et al. 2010). A gene encoding a putative
362 lytic enzyme was identified, expressed and shown to lyse *M. ruminantium*. Such lytic
363 enzyme is potentially very useful biocontrol agents for manipulating of rumen
364 methanogenic populations (Leahy et al. 2010). The genome sequence of
365 *Methanobrevibacter* AbM4 and *Methanobrevibacter boviskoreani* strain JH1 revealed
366 the presence of prophage/ phage like elements in strain JH1 while AbM4 is lacking in
367 gene encoding prophage (Lee at al. 2013a and Leahy et al. 2013). Phages are host and
368 even strain specific, so phage-based methane mitigation strategies could be developed
369 without affecting other phylogenetically distinct microbes in the rumen. However, hosts
370 and phages are also known to be involved in a rapid evolutionary race as the host
371 changes to avoid infection and the phage changes to maintain infectivity.
372 In combination with the application of other phage enzymes and structural components,
373 a rotation system can be envisioned that may overcome the rapid adaptation
374 mechanisms of microbes to phage challenges. More methanogenic phages need to be
375 identified, sequenced and characterized to identify and employ such phage-based

strategies. However, high specificity of phages may also be a limiting factor in their effectiveness in reducing methane emissions, since there appears to be a high diversity of methanogens in rumen (Janssen and Kirs 2008). Finally, either mixture of phages or structural components of phages may prove useful against the greater diversity of methanogens in rumen.

Immunization

Host immunization commonly offers a diverse and ecofriendly solution to the problems especially associated with animal health. Therefore, developing vaccines against methanogens appears to be an alternative and attractive approach, which can avoid many of the issues mentioned above related to methane mitigation from ruminants. Wright et al. (2004) developed two vaccines, VF3 (based on three methanogenic strains 1Y, AK-87 and ZA-10) and VF7 (based on seven methanogens), that produced a 7.7% methane reduction in sheep (g per kg of dry matter intake); despite targeting only a minority (20%) of methanogens present within these host animals. They also created a vaccine based on five methanogens (*Methanobrevibacter s*pp. strains 1Y, AK-87, *M. millerae* ZA-10, *Methanomicrobium mobile* BP and *Methanosphaera stadtmanae* MCB-3) that was administered in three vaccinations to sheep (Williams et al. 2009). Surprisingly, immunization with this second vaccine caused methane output to increase by 18%, despite the fact that a larger proportion of the methanogenic population (52%) was targeted. Thus, further work is needed to optimize the individual components of these vaccines such that the most potent methanogens are specifically targeted.

Researchers believe that anti-methanogenic vaccines will only yield the short term reductions in methanogens and/ or methanogenesis, due to the possible proteolytic degradation and low persistence of host antibodies in rumen (Li et al. 2007; Cook et al.

400 2008; Lascano and Cárdenas 2010). Vaccination of sheep with entodinial or mixed
401 protozoa antigens reduced protozoa and the released IgG antibodies against rumen
402 protozoa remained active and continued to bind the target cells up to 8 hours (Williams
403 et al. 2008). Vaccines targeting single surface antigens may not be effective, as
404 methanogenic archaea differs largely based on their host, diet as well as geographical
405 regions (Zhou et al. 2009). A new vaccine has been developed using sub-cellular
406 fractions (cytoplasmic and cell wall derived protein) of *Methanobrevibacter*
407 *ruminantium* M1 (Wedlock et al. 2010). Twenty sheep were vaccinated, then booster
408 doses were given after three weeks, and the antisera were found to agglutinate and
409 decrease the growth of archaeal methanogens and methane production *in vitro*.
410 *In vivo* efficacy of the vaccine on methanogens is yet to be evaluated. Based on liquid
411 chromatography mass spectrometer, it was reported that most of the proteins were
412 intracellular enzymes, particularly methyl-coenzyme M reductase, and these
413 intracellular proteins would not be suitable as vaccine antigens owing to their
414 inaccessibility for antibody binding. Since, there is the growing database for the genome
415 sequences of rumen methanogens, the possibility of finding new target antigens/
416 proteins using comparative and pangenomics analysis have increased. The genome
417 based reverse vaccine approach may also help in mining the new vaccine targets that
418 might prove successful for efficacious vaccination against methanogens. Furthermore,
419 extensive research is needed to identify adjuvants that stimulate high titer of antibody
420 and are suitable for formulating with protein antigens to produce a low-cost and
421 effective vaccine.
422 Overall, the genome sequencing will be leading to the better understandings toward
423 methanogenic interactions with other microbes in the rumen suggesting some methane

mitigation possibilities. The genomic techniques have provided positive clues for probable vaccine targets of methanogens in the rumen. Such approaches in future will optimistically lead to methane reducing practices for farm animals. However, the vaccine based inhibition method will have to pass the regulatory systems to guaranty animal health.

Chemogenomics: An upcoming strategy

Genome sequencing of microbes is actually a useful technique that can provide information directly applicable to methane mitigation strategies from ruminants, based either on vaccines development or small molecule inhibitor practices. Further, it can help to identify methane inhibitors by predicting and/or determining specific enzyme structures. This can define the geometry of the enzyme's active site and help to design the molecules that fit exactly into the active site and hence, can inhibit/ block the enzyme's catalytic function. This approach identifies inhibitory molecules that can be tested for their effectiveness in animal trials.

For reaching to a realistic solution to the problem of methane emissions, the technologies for reducing enteric methane must effectively target all the rumen methanogens (major and minor groups), otherwise less abundant methanogens may occupy the vacated niches and lead to normal methanogenesis. Besides, they should not affect other microbes present in the rumen, so that rumen function would not be altered. For this, an understanding of the diversity and physiology of rumen methanogens is essentially required, that not only identifies the dominant methanogens in a particular geographical area, but also the conserved sequences that can be targeted. In this regard, more genome sequences of methanogens are required to validate that the targets are common and effective among all the methanogens in the rumen (Attwood et al. 2011).

448 The completed *M. ruminantium* genome and draft sequences from other rumen
449 methanogenic species are paving the way for identification of the underlying cellular
450 mechanisms that define these microbes, leading to a better understanding of their micro-
451 ecology within the rumen. Aside from this, the genome sequence of *M. ruminantium*,
452 draft genome sequence of *M. boviskoreani* strain JH1 from Korean native cattle
453 (HanWoo) and AbM4 from abomasum's of sheep have been published (Lee et al.
454 2013a; Leahy et al. 2013). The strain AbM4 do not code for many adhesion-like
455 proteins, which indicates that it invest less on the external interactions with its
456 environment compared to strain JH1. Moreover, AbM4 has a broader repertoire of
457 cofactors and coenzymes, which shows its lesser dependence on the other rumen
458 microbes and CoM in the medium. On the contrary, strain JH1 showed very good
459 growth in presence of both CoM and VFA in the medium, and had genes and enzymes
460 for CO_2 plus hydrogen, as well as for formate utilization, so that these enzymes possibly
461 can be targeted for inhibition of methanogenesis.
462 Another gene, which can be further targeted, is the membrane associated transpeptidase.
463 The Mtr enzyme complex can also be used for the development of vaccines. The
464 phylogenetic analysis using Maximum-Likelihood inference method (MEGA 5.1) with
465 1000 boot strapping, and genomic sequence shows that strain JH1 and AbM4 likely
466 belong to the same species and is related to *M. wolinii*. At present, this research is
467 mainly at exploratory stage but several promising leads for chemogenomic targets are
468 being investigated as possible intervention points for the inhibition of rumen
469 methanogens. The cellular studies indicate that many of the conserved enzyme targets
470 are involved in energy generation via methanogenesis, while majority of the conserved
471 surface protein targets are of unknown function.

Bioinformatic approaches used for the inhibitor prediction against F420 dependent NADP oxidoreductase enzyme that catalyzes an important electron transfer step in the methanogenesis from *Methanobrevibacter smithii* reveal that lovastatin and compactin had high affinity to the enzyme and can act as potential inhibitors (Sharma et al. 2011). Both *in silico* approaches and *in vitro* enzyme assays may be useful for screening chemical inhibitors of methanogenesis.

The analysis of more genome sequences of rumen methanogens would help to identify potential methane inhibitors. According to the recent report of Lee et al. (2013a, b), only very few rumen methanogens are cultured as pure isolates and 13 genome projects are completed as yet (Leahy et al. 2013; Morgavi et al. 2013). Most of these genome sequences are from genus *Methanobrevibacter*, which is considered to be dominating rumen methanogen, as per the global data set of rumen microbes (Jansen and Kirs, 2008; Jeyanathan et al. 2011; Cheng et al. 2009; Williams et al. 2009, Zhou et al. 2009). In near future, with the development of "Hungate1000", a catalogue of 1000 reference microbial genomes from the rumen (http://www.hungate1000.org.nz/), genomic dataset of rumen microbiome will be numerically high, thereby more targets for anti-methanogenic strategies can be identified and used for improving the animal health, productivity and beyond. Furthermore, single-cell isolation technique from the complex rumen community would provide more advantage, over isolation approach, and their whole genome sequencing can be accomplished later.

Researchers are currently investigating, whether animal variation in methane emission is controlled by a heritable characteristic. Although clear and persistent individual differences in methane emissions have been found among animals fed the same diet (Pinares-Patiño et al. 2003, 2011; Martínez et al. 2010), it has not been yet clearly

established whether the low emission trait is associated with any unwanted side effects. Currently, it is not possible to say whether in future it will be possible to breed animals that produce lesser methane per unit of intake or not (Clark 2013). Overall, the chemogenomics allowed us to identify the key features of rumen methanogens that can be targeted to inhibit them and to mitigate enteric methane production, eventually reducing the release of anthropogenic GHGs in the environment.

Final remarks

Looking at the facts in a comprehensive manner, profiling of rumen methanogens seem to be an important tool for ensuring sustainability of ruminant based agriculture production systems. However, for successful methane mitigation strategies to be developed and adopted, a thorough understanding of the microbial ecology of rumen methanogens is essentially required. DNA-based microbial profiling to explore ruminant methane mitigation will support how the rumen microbes can be manipulated without hampering the animal's production potential. These approaches would identify the involved microbial species based on genome sequences. By comparing microbial profiles of animals, one can identify the microbial shifts in response to the methane mitigation strategies. Some of the dietary strategies used in different studies have produced changes in rumen microbial communities as revealed by profiling assays. The comparison of rumen microflora both in high and low methane producers will help in determining if the changes in the microbiota can be directly or indirectly linked to the reduced methane emissions (Ross et al. 2013). In addition, genetic improvement and management practices for increasing ruminant productivity and abating methane emissions, in conjunction with other strategies, can also play an important role in lowering enteric methane emissions globally. Finally, it must be taken into account that

there should be some economic return to the producers, if strategies to reduce methane emissions are expected to be implemented at farm level, and that any adopted strategy should also ensure animal health, food security and environmental safety.

Acknowledgements

We thankfully acknowledge the DBT-CREST fellowship 2011-12 to Anil K Puniya for visiting Aberystwyth University (UK) that greatly helped in developing the manuscript in collaboration with our overseas experts. We are also thankful to NICRA and VTCC ongoing network programmes at NDRI (ICAR), Karnal (India) for providing the necessary support for writing the manuscript.

References

Abecia L, Toral PG, Martín-García AI, Martínez G, Tomkins NW, Molina-Alcaide E, Newbold CJ, Yáñez-Ruiz DR (2012) Effect of bromochloromethane on methane emission, rumen fermentation pattern, milk yield, and fatty acid profile in lactating dairy goats. J Dairy Sci 95:2027-2036

Ackermann HW (2007) 5500 Phages examined in the electron microscope. Arch Virol 152:227-243

Ackermann HW, Kropinski AM (2007) Curated list of prokaryote viruses with fully sequenced genomes**.** Res Microbiol 158:555-566

Aluwong T, Wuyep P, Allam L (2011) Livestock-environment interactions: Methane emissions from ruminants. Afr J Biotechnol 10:1265-1269

Animut G, Puchala R, Goetsch A, Patra A, Sahlu T, Varel V, Wells J (2008) Methane emission by goats consuming diets with different levels of condensed tannins from lespedeza. Anim Feed Sci Technol 144: 212-227

543 Attwood G, McSweeney C (2008) Methanogen genomics to discover targets for
544 methane mitigation technologies and options for alternative H_2 utilization in the
545 rumen. Aust J Exp Agr 48:28-37
546 Attwood GT, Altermann E, Kelly WJ, Leahy SC, Zhang L, Morrison M (2011)
547 Exploring rumen methanogen genomes to identify targets for methane mitigation
548 strategies. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166:65-75
549 Beauchemin K, Kreuzer M, O'mara F, McAllister T (2008) Nutritional management for
550 enteric methane abatement: a review. Aust J Exp Agr 48:21-27
551 Beauchemin K, McGinn SM, Petit HV (2007) Methane abatement strategies for cattle:
552 lipid supplementation of diets. Can J Anim Sci 87:431-440
553 Beauchemin KA, McGinn SM (2006a) Enteric methane emissions from growing beef
554 cattle as affected by diet and level of intake. Can J Anim Sci 86:401-408
555 Beauchemin KA, McGinn SM (2006b) Methane emissions from beef cattle: Effects of
556 fumaric acid, essential oil, and canola oil. J Anim Sci 84:1489-1496
557 Benchaar C, Greathead H (2011) Essential oils and opportunities to mitigate enteric
558 methane emissions from ruminants. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:338-355
559 Berg Miller ME, Yeoman CJ, Chia N, Tringe SG, Angly FE, Edwards RA, Flint HJ,
560 Lamed R, Bayer EA, White BA (2012) Phage–bacteria relationships and CRISPR
561 elements revealed by a metagenomic survey of the rumen microbiome Environ
562 Microbiol 14(1):207-227
563 Bhatt VD, Dande SS, Patil NV, Joshi CG (2013) Molecular analysis of the bacterial
564 microbiome in the forestomach fluid from the dromedary camel (*Camelus*
565 *dromedaries*) Mol Biol Rep 40:3363-3371

566 Bhatta R, Saravanan M, Baruah L, Dhali A, Kolte A, Prasad CS (2013) Effect of graded
567 levels of tropical leaves containing-seconday metabolites on rumen fermentation
568 pattern, protozoa population and methanogenesis *in vitro.* Advances in Animal
569 Biosciences 4 (2) pp 307
570 Bhatta R, Uyeno Y, Tajima K, Takenaka A, Yabumoto Y, Nonaka I, Enishi O, Kurihara
571 M (2009) Difference in nature of tannins on in vitro ruminal methane and volatile
572 fatty acid production and on methanogenic archaea and protozoal populations. J
573 Dairy Sci 92:5512–5522.
574 Bird SH, Hegarty R, Woodgate R (2010) Modes of transmission of rumen protozoa
575 between mature sheep. Anim Prod Sci 50:414-417
576 Bodas R, Prieto N, García-González R, Andrés S, Giráldez FJ, López S (2012)
577 Manipulation of rumen fermentation and methane production with plant secondary
578 metabolites. Anim Feed Sci Technol 176:78-93
579 Brask M, Lund P, Weisbjerg MR, Hellwing AL, Poulsen M, Larsen MK, Hvelplund T
580 (2013) Methane production and digestion of different physical forms of rapeseed as
581 fat supplement in dairy cows. J Dairy Sci 96:2356-2365
582 Brulc JM, Antonopoulos DA, Rincon MT, Band M, Bari A, Akraiko T, Hernandez A,
583 Thimmapuram J, Henrissat B, Coutinho PM, Borovok I, Jindou S, Lamed R, Flint
584 HJ, Bayer EA, White BA (2009) Gene-centric metagenomics of the fibre-adherent
585 bovine rumen microbiome reveals forage specific glycoside hydrolases. Proc Natl
586 Acad Sci USA 106:1948-1953
587 Busquet M, Calsamiglia S, Ferret A, Carro MD, Kamel C (2005) Effect of garlic oil and
588 four of its compounds on rumen microbial fermentation. J Dairy Sci 88:4393-4404

589 Calabrò S, Cutrignelli MI, Guglielmelli A, Tudisco R, Piccolo V, Grossi M, Infascelli F
590 (2012) *In vitro* methane production from different feeds. Proc. 1st Int. Conf. on
591 Animal Nutrition and Environment, Sep. 14-15, Khon Kaen (Thailand), pp109-112
592 Callaway T, Martin S, Wampler J, Hill N, Hill G (1997) Malate content of forage
593 varieties commonly fed to cattle. J Dairy Sci 80:1651-1655
594 Calsamiglia S, Busquet M, Cardozo P, Castillejos L, Ferret A (2007) Invited review:
595 essential oils as modifiers of rumen microbial fermentation. J Dairy Sci 90: 2580-
596 2595
597 Cammack KM, Ellison MJ, Conant GC, Austin KJ, Lamberson WR (2013) Effect of
598 diet type and feed efficiency status on rumen microbial populations in sheep. In 5th
599 Greenhouse Gases and Animal Agriculture Conference, p. 372. Dublin, Ireland:
600 Cambridge University Press.
601 Carro MD, Lebzien P, Rohr K (1992) Influence of yeast culture on the "in vitro"
602 fermentation (Rusitec) of diets containing variable portions of concentrates. Anim
603 Feed Sci Technol 37:209-220
604 Carro MD, López S, Valdés C, Ovejero FJ (1999) Effect of DL-malate on mixed
605 ruminal microorganism fermentation using the rumen simulation technique
606 (RUSITEC). Anim Feed Sci Technol 79:279-288
607 Carro MD, Ranilla MJ (2003a) Effect of the addition of malate on *in vitro* rumen
608 fermentation of cereal grains. Br J Nutr 89:181-188
609 Carro MD, Ranilla MJ (2003b) Influence of different concentrations of disodium
610 fumarate on methane production and fermentation of concentrate feeds by rumen
611 micro-organisms *in vitro*. Br J Nutr 90:617-623

612 Carro MD, Ranilla MJ, Giráldez FJ, Mantecón AR (2006) Effects of malate
613 supplementation on feed intake, digestibility, microbial protein synthesis and plasma
614 metabolites in lambs fed a high-concentrate diet. J Anim Sci 84:405-410
615 Carulla JE, Kreuzer M, Machmüller A, Hess HD (2005) Supplementation of *Acacia*
616 *mearnsii* tannins decreases methanogenesis and urinary nitrogen in forage-fed
617 sheep. Aust J Agr Res 56:961-970
618 Cheng YF, Edwards JE, Allison GG, Zhu W-Y, Theodorou MK (2009) Diversity and
619 activity of enriched ruminal cultures of anaerobic fungi and methanogens grown
620 together on lignocellulose in consecutive batch culture. Bioresour Technol
621 100:4821–4828
622 Cieslak A, Szumacher-Strabel M, Stochmal A, Oleszek W (2013) Plant components
623 with specific activities against rumen methanogens. Animal 7:253-265.
624 Clark H (2013) Nutritional and host effects on methanogenesis in the grazing ruminant.
625 Animal 7:41-48
626 Clark H, Kelliher F, Pinares-Patino C (2011) Reducing CH_4 emissions from grazing
627 ruminants in New Zealand: challenges and opportunities. Asian-Aust J Anim Sci
628 24:295–302
629 Cook S, Maiti P, Chaves A, Benchaar C, Beauchemin K, McAllister T (2008) Avian
630 (IgY) anti-methanogen antibodies for reducing ruminal methane production: *in vitro*
631 assessment of their effects. Aust J Exp Agr 48:260-264
632 Dai X, Zhu Yaxin, Luo Y, Song L, Liu D, Liu L, Chen F, Wang M,, Li J, Zeng X, Dong
633 Z, Hu S, Li L, Xu J, Huang L, Dong X (2012) Metagenomic insights into the
634 fibrolytic microbiome in yak rumen. PLoS ONE 7(7):e40430

635 Denman SE, Tomkins NW, McSweeney CS (2007) Quantitation and diversity analysis
636 of ruminal methanogenic populations in response to the anti-methanogenic
637 compound bromochloromethane. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 62:313-322
638 Ding X, Long R, Zhang Q, Huang X, Guo X, Mi J (2012) Reducing methane emissions
639 and the methanogen population in the rumen of Tibetan sheep by dietary
640 supplementation with coconut oil. Trop Anim Health Pro 44:1541-1545
641 Dohme F, Machmuller A, Estermann BL, Pfister P, Wasserfallen A, Kreuzer M (1999)
642 The role of the rumen ciliate protozoa for methane suppression caused by coconut
643 oil. Lett Appl Microbiol 29:187-192
644 Dohme F, Machmüller A, Wasserfallen A, Kreuzer M (2000) Comparative efficiency of
645 various fats rich in medium-chain fatty acids to suppress ruminal methanogenesis as
646 measured with RUSITEC. Can J Anim Sci 80:473-484
647 Dohme F, Machmüller A, Wasserfallen A, Kreuzer M (2001) Ruminal methanogenesis
648 as influenced by individual fatty acids supplemented to complete ruminant diets.
649 Lett Appl Microbiol 32:47-51
650 Eckard R, Grainger C, De Klein C (2010) Options for the abatement of methane and
651 nitrous oxide from ruminant production: A review. Livest Sci 130: 47-56
652 FAO (2010) Greenhouse gas emissions from the dairy sector. A life cycle assessment.
653 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy
654 Foley P, Kenny D, Callan J, Boland T, O'mara F (2009a) Effect of DL-malic acid
655 supplementation on feed intake, methane emission, and rumen fermentation in beef
656 cattle. J Anim Sci 87:1048-1057

657 Foley PA, Kenny DA, Lovett DK, Callan JJ, Boland TM, O'Mara FP (2009b) Effect of
658 dl-malic acid supplementation on feed intake, methane emissions, and performance
659 of lactating dairy cows at pasture. J Dairy Sci 92:3258-3264
660 Fonty G, Joblin K, Chavarot M, Roux R, Naylor G, Michallon F (2007) Establishment
661 and development of ruminal hydrogenotrophs in methanogen-free lambs. Appl
662 Environ Microbiol 73:6391-6403
663 Gandra JR, nunes Gil PC, Consolo NRB, Gandra ERS, Gobesso AAO (2012) Addition
664 of increasing doses of ricinoleic acid from castor oil (*Ricinus communis* L.) in dites
665 of Nellore steers in feedlots. J Anim Feed Sci 21:566-576.
666 García-Martínez R, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2005) Effects of disodium
667 fumarate on in vitro rumen microbial growth, methane production and fermentation
668 of diets differing in their forage:concentrate ratio. Br J Nutr 94:71-77
669 Giraldo LA, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2007a) Efecto de la sustitución de
670 *Brachiaria dictyoneura* or *Acacia mangium* sobre la fermentación ruminal *in vitro*
671 (Effects of substitution of *Brachiaria dictyoneura* by *Acacia mangium*on *in vitro*
672 ruminal fermentation). Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Pecuarias 29:39-46
673 Giraldo LA, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2007b) Influence of exogenous
674 fibrolytic enzyme and fumarate on methane production, microbial growth and
675 fermentation in Rusitec fermenters. Br J Nutr 98:753-761
676 Goel G, Puniya AK, Aguilar, CN, Singh K (2005) Interaction of gut microflora with
677 tannins in feeds. Naturwissenschaften 92:497–503
678 Gómez JA, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2005) Mixed rumen microorganisms growth and
679 rumen fermentation of two diets in RUSITEC fermenters: influence of disodium
680 malate supplementation. Br J Nutr 93:479-484

681 Grainger C, Beauchemin KA (2011) Can enteric methane emissions from ruminants be
682 lowered without lowering their production? Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:308-
683 320
684 Guglielmelli A, Calabrò S, Primi R, Carone F, Cutrignelli MI, Tudisco R, Piccolo G,
685 Ronchi B, Danieli PP (2011) *In vitro* fermentation patterns and methane production
686 of sainfoin (*Onobrychis viciifolia* Scop.) hay with different condensed tannin
687 contents. Grass and Forage Science 66:488-500
688 Haisan J, Sun Y, Beauchemin K, Guan L, Duval S, Barreda DR, Oba M (2013) Effects
689 of feeding 3-nitrooxypropanol, at varying levels, on methane emissions and rumen
690 fermentation in lactating dairy cows. Advances in Animal Biosciences 4 (2) pp 326
691 Hegarty R, Bird S, Vanselow B, Woodgate R (2010) Effects of the absence of
692 protozoa from birth or from weaning on the growth and methane production of
693 lambs. Br J Nutr 100:1220-1227
694 Hess H, Tiemann T, Noto F, Carulla J, Kreuzer M (2006) Strategic use of tannins as
695 means to limit methane emission from ruminant livestock, International Congress
696 Series Elsevier, pp164-167
697 Hess M, Sczybra A, Egan R, Kim TW, Chokhawala H, Schroth G, Luo S, Clark DS,
698 Chen F, Zhang T, Mackie RI, Pennacchio LA, Tringe SG, Visel A, Woyke T, Wang
699 Z, Rubin EM (2011) Metagenomic discovery of biomass-degrading genes and
700 genomes from cow rumen. Science 331:463-467
701 Holtshausen L, Chaves A, Beauchemin K, McGinn S, McAllister T, Odongo N, Cheeke
702 P, Benchaar C (2008) Feeding saponin-containing *Yucca schidigera* and *Quillaja*
703 *saponaria* to decrease enteric methane production in dairy cows. J Dairy Sci
704 92:2809-2821

705 Hook SE, Northwood KS, Wright AD, McBride BW (2009) Long-term monensin
706 supplementation does not significantly affect the quantity or diversity of
707 methanogens in the rumen of the lactating dairy cow. Appl Environ Microbiol
708 75:374-380
709 Hook SE, Wright AD, McBride BW (2010) Methanogens: methane producers of the
710 rumen and mitigation strategies. Hindawi Publishing Corporation. Archaea. Article
711 ID 945785. doi:10.1155/2010/945785
712 Jakhesara S, Koringa P, Ramani U, Ahir V, Tripathi A, Soni P, Singh K, Bhatt V, Patel
713 J., Patel M (2010) Comparative study of tannin challenged rumen microbiome in
714 goat using high throughput sequencing technology. Developmental Microbiology
715 and Molecular Biology 1: 95-106
716 Janssen PH (2010) Influence of hydrogen on rumen methane formation and
717 fermentation balances through microbial growth kinetics and fermentation
718 thermodynamics. Anim Feed Sci Technol 160:1-22
719 Janssen PH, Kirs M (2008) Structure of the archaeal community of the rumen. Appl
720 Environ Microbiol 74:3619-3625
721 Jayanegara FL, Kreuzer M (2011) Meta-analysis of the relationship between dietary
722 tannin level and methane formation in ruminants from *in vivo* and *in vitro*
723 experiments. J Anim Physiol Anim Nutr (Berl) 96(3):365-75
724 Jeyanathan J, Kirs M, Rominus RS, Hoskin SO, Jassen PH (2011) Methanogen
725 community structure in the rumens of farmed sheep, cattle and red deer fed different
726 diets. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 74:311-326
727 Joblin K (1999) Ruminal acetogens and their potential to lower ruminant methane
728 emissions. Aust J Agr Res 50:1307-1313

729 Joblin K (2005) Methanogenic archaea, In: Makker, H, McSweeney, C. (Eds.), Methods
730 in gut microbial ecology for ruminants, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp 47-53
731 Johnson K, Johnson DE (1995) Methane emissions from cattle. J Anim Sci 73:2483-
732 2492
733 Jordan E, Kenny D, Hawkins M, Malone R, Lovett D, O'Mara F (2006a) Effect of
734 refined soy oil or whole soybeans on intake, methane output, and performance of
735 young bulls. J Anim Sci 84:2418-2425
736 Jordan E, Lovett D, Monahan F, Callan J, Flynn B, O'Mara F (2006b) Effect of refined
737 coconut oil or copra meal on methane output and on intake and performance of beef
738 heifers. J Anim Sci 84:162-170
739 Kamel C, Greathead HMR, Tejido ML, Ranilla MJ, Carro MD (2008) Effect of allicin
740 and diallyldisulfide on *in vitro* rumen fermentation of a mixed diet. Anim Feed Sci
741 Technol 145:351-363
742 Kamra DN, Pawar M, Singh B (2012) Effect of plant secondary metabolites on rumen
743 methanogens and methane emissions by ruminants. Dietary Phytochemicals and
744 Microbes, pp 351-370
745 Key N, Tallard G (2012) Mitigating methane emissions from livestocks: a global
746 analysis of sector policies. Clim Change 112:387-414
747 Knight T, Ronimus RS, Dey D, Tootill C, Naylor G, Evans P, Molano G, Smith A,
748 Tavendale M, Pinares-Patino CS, Clark H (2011) Chloroform decreases rumen
749 methanogenesis and methanogen populations without altering rumen function in
750 cattle. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:101-112

751 Kong Y, He M, McAlister T, Seviour R, Forster R (2010) Quantitative fluorescence *in*
752 *situ* hybridization of microbial communities in the rumens of cattle fed different
753 diets. Appl Environ Microbiol 76(20):6933–6938
754 Kongmun P, Wanapat M, Pakdee P, Navanukraw C (2010) Effect of coconut oil and
755 garlic powder on in vitro fermentation using gas production technique. Livest Sci
756 127:38-44
757 Kumar S, Dagar SS and Puniya AK (2012) Isolation and characterization of
758 methanogens from rumen of Murrah buffalo. Ann Microbiol 62:345-350
759 Kumar S, Dagar SS, Puniya AK, Upadhyay RC, (2013a) Changes in methane emission,
760 rumen fermentation in response to diet and microbial interactions. Res Vet Sci
761 94:263-268
762 Kumar S, Dagar SS, Sirohi SK, Upadhyay RC, Puniya AK (2013b) Microbial profiles,
763 *in vitro* gas production, dry matter digestibility based on various ratios of roughage
764 to concentrate. Ann Microbiol 63:541–545
765 Kumar S, Puniya AK, Puniya M, Dagar S, Sirohi S, Singh K, Griffith G (2009) Factors
766 affecting rumen methanogens and methane mitigation strategies. World J Microbiol
767 Biotechnol 25:1557-1566
768 Lascano CE, Cárdenas E (2010) Alternatives for methane emission mitigation in
769 livestock systems. Rev Bras Zootecn 39:175-182
770 Leahy SC, Kelly WJ, Altermann E, Ronimus RS, Yeoman CJ, Pacheco DM, Li D,
771 Kong Z, McTavish S, Sang C (2010) The genome sequence of the rumen
772 methanogen *Methanobrevibacter ruminantium* reveals new possibilities for
773 controlling ruminant methane emissions. PLoS One 5:e8926

774 Leahy SC, Kelly WJ, Li D, Altermann E, Lambie SC, Cox F, Attwood GT (2013) The
775 complete genome sequence of *Methanobrevibacter* sp. AbM4. Stand Genomic Sci
776 8:2
777 Lee J-H, Kumar S, Lee G-H, Chang D-H, Rhee M-S, , Kim D-S, Yoon M-H, Kim B-C
778 (2013b) *Methanobrevibacter boviskoreani* sp. nov., isolated from the rumen of
779 Korean native cattle. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol (In Press) doi 10.1007/s13213-012-
780 0501-0
781 Lee J-H, Rhee M-S, Kumar S, Lee G-H, Chang D-H, Kim D-S, Choi S-H, Lee D-W,
782 Kim B-C (2013a) Genome sequence of *Methanobrevibacter* sp. strain JH1, isolated
783 from rumen of Korean native cattle. Genome Announc 1:e00002-13
784 Li RW, Connor EE, Li C, Baldwin RL, Sparks ME (2012) Characterization of the
785 rumen microbiota of pre-ruminant calves using metagenomic tools. Environ
786 Microbiol 14(1):129-139
787 Li XY, Jin LJ, McAllister TA, Stanford K, Xu JY, Lu YN, Zhen YH, Sun YX, Xu YP
788 (2007) Chitosan-alginate microcapsules for oral delivery of egg yolk
789 immunoglobulin (IgY). J Agric Food Chem 55, 2911-2917
790 Ludemann CI, Eckard RJ, Smith KF (2013) Potential effects of time of cutting and plant
791 genotypes and gas production from fermentation of perennial ryegrass (*Lolium*
792 *perenne*) using dairy cow rumen. Advances in Animal Biosciences 4(2) pp 424
793 Lunsin R, Wanapat M, Yuangklang C, Rowlinson P (2012) Effect of rice bran oil
794 supplementation on rumen fermentation, milk yield and milk composition in
795 lactating dairy cows. Livest Sci 145:167-173

796 Luo Y, Pfister P, Leisinger T, Wasserfallen A (2001) The Genome of archaeal prophage
797 ψm100 encodes the lytic enzyme responsible for autolysis of *Methanothermobacter*
798 *wolfeii*. J Bacteriol 183:5788-5792
799 Lynch H, Martin S (2002) Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* culture and
800 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* live cells on *in vitro* mixed ruminal microorganism
801 fermentation. J Dairy Sci 85, 2603-2608
802 Machmüller A, Kreuzer M (1999) Methane suppression by coconut oil and associated
803 effects on nutrient and energy balance in sheep. Can J Anim Sci 79:65-72
804 Martin C, Morgavi DP, Doreau M (2010) Methane mitigation in ruminants: From
805 microbe to the farm scale. Animal 4:351-365
806 Martin S, Nisbet D (1990) Effects of Aspergillus oryzae fermentation extract on
807 fermentation of amino acids, bermudagrass and starch by mixed ruminal
808 microorganisms *in vitro*. J Anim Sci 68:2142-2149
809 Martin SA, Macy J (1985) Effects of monensin, pyromellitic diimide and 2-
810 bromoethanesulfonic acid on rumen fermentation *in vitro*. J Anim Sci 60:544
811 Martin SA, Streeter M (1995) Effect of malate on *in vitro* mixed ruminal
812 microorganism fermentation. J Anim Sci 73:2141-2145
813 Martínez ME, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Ramos S, Carro MD (2010) The effect of the diet
814 fed to donor sheep on *in vitro* methane production and ruminal fermentation of diets
815 of variable composition. Anim Feed Sci Technol 158:126–135
816 Martinez-Fernndez G, Arco A, Abecia L, Cantalapiedra-Hijar G, Moline-Alcaide E,
817 Martin-Garcia AI, Kindermann M, Duval S, Yanez-ruiz DR (2013) The addition of
818 Ethyl-3-nitrooxy propionate and 3-Nitrooxypropanol in the diet of sheep

substantially reduces methane emissions and the effect persists over a month. Advances in Animal Biosciences 4 (2) pp 368

Mateos I, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Saro C, Kamel C, Carro MD (2013) The influence of diet on the effectiveness of garlic oil and cinnamaldehyde to manipulate *in vitro* ruminal fermentation and methane production. Anim Prod Sci. 53:299-307

Mathieu F, Jouany JP, Senaud J, Bohatier J, Bertin G, Mercier M (1996) The effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae* on fermentations in the rumen of faunated and defaunated sheep; protozoal and probiotic interactions. Reprod Nutr Devel 36:271-287

May C, Payne AL, Stewart PL, Edgar JA (1995) A delivery system for agents, In: International Patent Application No. PCT/AU95/00733

McAllister TA, Newbold CJ (2008) Redirecting rumen fermentation to reduce methanogenesis. Aust J Exp Agr 48:7-13

McCrabb GJ, Berger KT, Magner T, May C, Hunter RA (1997) Inhibiting methane production in Brahman cattle by dietary supplementation with a novel compound and the effects on growth. Aust J Agr Res 48:323-329

Meale S, Chaves A, Baah J, McAllister T (2012) Methane production of different forages in *in vitro* ruminal fermentation. Asian Austral J Anim Sci 25:86-91

Morgavi DP, Jouany JP, Martin C (2008) Changes in methane emission and rumen fermentation parameters induced by refaunation in sheep. Aust J Exp Agr 48:69-72

Morgavi DP, Kelly WJ, Janssen PH, Attwood GT (2013) Rumen microbial (meta)genomics and its application to ruminant production. Animal 7:184-201.

Moss AR, Jouany JP, Newbold J (2000) Methane production by ruminants: its contribution to global warming. Ann Zootech 49:231-254

843 Nevel CV, Demeyer D (1995) Feed additives and other interventions for decreasing
844 methane emissions. Biotech Anim Feeds Anim Feeding 17:329-349
845 Newbold C, McIntosh F, Wallace R (1998) Changes in the microbial population of a
846 rumen-simulating fermenter in response to yeast culture. Can J Anim Sci 78:241-
847 244
848 Niderkorn V, Baumont R, Le Morvan A, Macheboeuf D (2011) Occurrence of
849 associative effects between grasses and legumes in binary mixtures on *in vitro*
850 rumen fermentation characteristics. J Anim Sci 89:1138-1145
851 Odongo N, Or-Rashid M, Kebreab E, France J, McBride B (2007) Effect of
852 supplementing myristic acid in dairy cow rations on ruminal methanogenesis and
853 fatty acid profile in milk. J Dairy Sci 90:1851-1858
854 O'Kelly J, Spiers W (1992) Effect of monensin on methane and heat productions of
855 [Brahman] steers fed lucerne hay either *ad libitum* or at the rate of 250 g per hour.
856 Aust J Agr Res 43:1789-1793
857 Patra AK (2012) Enteric methane mitigation technologies for ruminant livestock: a
858 synthesis of current research and future directions. Environ Monit Assess 184:1929-
859 1952
860 Patra AK, Kamra DN, Bhar R, Kumar R, Agarwal N (2011) Effect of *Terminalia*
861 *chebula* and *Allium sativum* on *in vivo* methane emission by sheep. J Anim Physiol
862 Anim Nutr 95:187-191
863 Patra AK, Saxena J (2009a) Dietary phytochemicals as rumen modifiers: a review of the
864 effects on microbial populations. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 96:363–375

865 Patra AK, Saxena J (2009b) The effect and mode of action of saponins on the microbial
866 populations and fermentation in the rumen and ruminant production. Nutr Res Rev
867 22:204-219
868 Patra AK, Yu Z (2012) Effects of essential oils on methane production and fermentation
869 by, and abundance and diversity of, rumen microbial populations. Appl Environ
870 Microbiol 78:4271-4280
871 Perez AR, Beauchemin KA, Okine EK, Duval SM (2013) Effect of 3-nitrooxypropanol
872 on methane production using rumen simulation technique (Rusitec). Advances in
873 Animal Biosciences 4 (2) pp 389
874 Pfister P, Wasserfallen A, Stettler R, Leisinger T (1998) Molecular analysis of
875 *Methanobacterium* phage ΨM2. Mol Microbiol 30:233-244
876 Pinares-Patiño CS, Ebrahimi SH, McEwan JC, Dodds KG, Clark H, Luo D (2011) Is
877 rumen retention time implicated in sheep differences in methane emissions?
878 Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production 71:219–222
879 Pinares-Patiño CS, Ulyatt MJ, Lassey KR, Barry TN, Holmes CW (2003) Persistence of
880 differences between sheep in methane emission under generous grazing conditions.
881 J Agric Sci 140:227–233
882 Pope PB, Denman SE, Jones M, Tringe SG, Barry K, Malfatti SA, McHardy AC, Cheng
883 J.-F, Hugenholtz P, McSweeney CS, Morrison M (2010) Adaptation to herbivory by
884 the Tammar wallaby includes bacterial and glycoside hydrolase profiles different
885 from other herbivores. Proc Natl Academy Sci.107(33):14793-14798
886 Pope PB, Mackenzie Ak, Gregor I, Smith W, Sundset MA, McHardy AC, Morrison M,
887 Eijsink VGH (2012) Metagenomics of the Svalbard reindeer rumen microbiome
888 reveals abundance of polysaccharide utilization loci. PLoS ONE 7(6):e38571

889 Poulsen M, Schwab C, Jensen BB, Engberg RM, Spang A, Canibe N, Hojberg O,
890 Milinovich G, Fragner L, Schleper C, Weckwerth W, Lund P, Schramm A, Urich T
891 (2013) Methylotrophic methanogenic Thermoplasmata implicated in reduced
892 methane emission from bovine rumen. Nat Commun 4:1428
893 Qi M, Wang P, O'Toole N, Barboza PS, Ungerfeld E, Leigh MB, Selinger LB, Butler
894 G, Tsang A, McAllister TA, Forster RJ (2011). Snapshot of the eukaryotic gene
895 expression in muskoxen rumen- a metatranscriptomics approach. Plos One 6:e20521
896 Ramirez-Restrepo C, Barry T (2005) Alternative temperate forages containing
897 secondary compounds for improving sustainable productivity in grazing ruminants.
898 Anim Feed Sci Technol 120:179-201
899 Ross EM, Moate PJ, Bath CR, Davidson SE, Sawbridge TI, Guthridge KM, Cocks BG
900 and Hayes BJ (2012) High throughput whole rumen metagenome profiling using
901 untargeted massively parallel sequencing. BMC Genetics 13:53
902 Ross Em, Moate PJ, Marett L, Cocks BG, Hayes BJ (2013) Investigating the effect of
903 two methane-mitigating diets on the rumen microbiome using massively parallel
904 sequencing. J Dairy Sci 96: 6030-6046
905 Russell JB (2002) Rumen microbiology and its role in rumen nutrition, 1st edn. Russell,
906 Ithaca, New York
907 Scheehle EA, Kruger D (2006) Global anthropogenic methane and nitrous oxide
908 emissions. Energy J 22:33-44
909 Sharma A, Chaudhary PP, Sirohi SK, Saxena J (2011) Structure modeling and
910 prediction of NADP oxidoreducatse enzyme from *Methanobrevibacter smithii*.
911 Bioinformation 6:15-19.

912 Shin EC, Choi BR, Lim WJ, Hong SY, An CL, Cho KM, Kim YK, An JM, Kang JM,
913 Lee SS, Kim H, Yun HD (2004) Phylogenetic analysis of archaea in three
914 fractions of cow rumen based on the 16S rDNA sequence. Anareobe 10:313-319.
915 Singh KM, Ahir VB, Tripathi AK, Ramani, UV, Sajnani M, Koringa PG, Jakhesara SJ,
916 Pandya PR, Rank DN, Murty DS, Kothari RK, Joshi CG (2012a) Metagenomic
917 analysis of Surti buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*) rumen: a preliminary study. Mol Bio Rep
918 39:4841-4848
919 Singh KM, Jakhesara SJ, Koringa PG, Rank DN, Joshi CG (2012b) Metagenomic
920 analysis of virulence-associated and antibiotic resistance genes of microbes in
921 rumen of Indian buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*) Gene 506:146-151
922 Soliva CR, Meile L, Cieslak A, Kreuzer M, Machmuller A (2004) Rumen simulation
923 technique study on the interactions of dietary lauric and myristic acid
924 supplementation in suppressing ruminal methanogenesis. Br J Nutr 92:689-700
925 Staerfl SM, Zeitz JO, Kreuzer M, Soliva CR (2012) Methane conversion rate of bulls
926 fattened on grass or maize silage as compared with the IPCC default values, and the
927 long-term methane mitigation efficiency of adding acacia tannin, garlic, maca and
928 lupine. Agric Ecosys Environ 148:111–120
929 Stanton TB (2007) Prophage-like gene transfer agents: Novel mechanisms of gene
930 exchange for *Methanococcus*, *Desulfovibrio*, *Brachyspira*, and *Rhodobacter* species.
931 Anaerobe 13:43-49
932 Tajima K, Nagamine T, Matsui H, Nakamura M, Aminov RI (2001) Phylogenetic
933 anaylsis of archaeal 16S rRNA libraries from the rumen suggests the existence of a
934 novel group of archaea not associated with known methanogens. FEMS Microbiol
935 Lett 200:67-72

936 Tavendale MH, Meagher LP, Pacheco D, Walker N, Attwood GT, Sivakumaran S
937 (2005) Methane production from *in vitro* rumen incubations with *Lotus*
938 *pedunculatus* and *Medicago sativa*, and effects of extractable condensed tannin
939 fractions on methanogenesis. Anim Feed Sci Technol 123:403-419
940 Teather RM, Forster JR (1998) Manipulating the rumen microflora with bacteriocins to
941 improve ruminant production. Can J Anim Sci 78:57-69
942 Tejido ML, Ranilla MJ, García-Martínez R, Carro MD (2005) *In vitro* microbial growth
943 and rumen fermentation of different diets as affected by the addition of disodium
944 malate. Anim Sci 81:31-38
945 Tezel U, Pierson JA, Pavlostathis SG (2006) Fate and effect of quaternary ammonium
946 compounds on a mixed methanogenic culture. Water Res 40:3660-3668
947 Thorpe A (2009) Enteric fermentation and ruminant eructation: the role (and control?)
948 of methane in the climate change debate. Clim Change 93:407
949 Tiemann TT, Lascano CE, Kreuzer M, Hess HD (2008) The ruminal degradability of
950 fibre explains part of the low nutritional value and reduced methanogenesis in
951 highly tanniniferous tropical legumes. J Sci Food Agric 88:1794-1803
952 Ungerfeld E, Forster RJ (2011) A meta-analysis of malate effects on methanogenesis in
953 ruminal batch cultures. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:282-290
954 Ungerfeld E, Kohn R, Wallace R, Newbold C (2007) A meta-analysis of fumarate
955 effects on methane production in ruminal batch cultures. J Anim Sci 85:2556-2563
956 Ungerfeld E, Rust SR, Broone DR, Liu Y (2004) Effects of several inhibitors on pure
957 cultures of ruminal methanogens. Appl Microbiol 97:520-526
958 Van Nevel C, Demeyer D (1996) Control of rumen methanogenesis. Environ Monit
959 Assess 42:73-97

960 Van Zijderveld SM, Fonken B, Dijkstra J, Gerrits WJ, Perdok HB, Fokkink W,
961 Newbold JR (2011) Effects of a combination of feed additives on methane
962 production, diet digestibility, and animal performance in lactating dairy cows. J
963 Dairy Sci 94:1445-1454
964 Waghorn G, Woodward S, Tavendale M, Clark D (2006) Inconsistencies in rumen
965 methane production-effects of forage composition and animal genotype, Elsevier, pp
966 115-118.
967 Wanapat M, Kongmun P, Poungchompu O, Cherdthong A, Khejornsart P, Pilajun R,
968 Kaenpakdee S (2012) Effects of plants containing secondary compounds and plant
969 oils on rumen fermentation and ecology. Trop Anim Health Pro 44:399-405
970 Wedlock D, Pedersen G, Denis M, Dey D, Janssen P, Buddle B (2010) Development of
971 a vaccine to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture: Vaccination of sheep
972 with methanogen fractions induces antibodies that block methane production *in*
973 *vitro*. New Zeal Vet J 58:29-36
974 Wedlock DN, Janssen PH, Leahy SC, Shu D, Buddle BM (2013) Progress in the
975 development of vaccines against rumen methanogens. Animal 7:244-252
976 Williams YJ, Popovski S, Rea SM, Skillman LC, Toovey AF, Northwood KS, Wright
977 AD (2009) A vaccine against rumen methanogens can alter the composition of
978 archaeal populations. Appl Environ Microbiol 75:1860-1866
979 Williams YJ, Rea SM, Popovski S, Pimm CL, Williams AJ, Toovey AF, Skillman LC,
980 Wright ADG (2008) Reponses of sheep to a vaccination of entodinial or mixed
981 rumen protozoal antigens to reduce rumen protozoal numbers. Br J Nutr 99:100-109

982 Wood T, Wallace R, Rowe A, Price J, Yáñez-Ruiz D, Murray P, Newbold C (2009)
983 Encapsulated fumaric acid as a feed ingredient to decrease ruminal methane
984 emissions. Anim Feed Sci Technol 152:62-71
985 Woodward S, Waghorn G, Ulyatt M, Lassey K (2001) Early indications that feeding
986 Lotus will reduce methane emissions from ruminants. New Zeal Soc Anim Pro
987 1999:23-26
988 Wright A, Kennedy P, O'Neill C, Toovey A, Popovski S, Rea S, Pimm C, Klein L
989 (2004) Reducing methane emissions in sheep by immunization against rumen
990 methanogens. Vaccine 22:3976-3985
991 Zhao S, Wang J, Bu D, Liu K, Zhu Y, Dog Z, Yu Z (2010) Novel glycoside hydrolases
992 identified by screening a chinese Holstein dairy cow rumen-derived metagenome
993 library. Appl Environ Microbiol 76:6701-6705
994 Zhou M, Hernandez-Sanabria E, Guan LL (2009) Assessment of the microbial ecology
995 of ruminal methanogens in cattle with different feed efficiencies. Appl Environ
996 Microbiol 75:6524-6533
997 Zhou X, Meile L, Kreuzer M, Zeitz JO (2013) The effect of lauric acid on methane
998 production and cell viability of *Methanobrevibacter ruminantium*. Adv Anim Biosci
999 4 (2):458
1000 Zhou YY, Mao HL, Jiang F, Wang JK, Liu JX, McSweeney CS (2011) Inhibition of
1001 rumen methanogenesis by tea saponins with reference to fermentation pattern and
1002 microbial communities in Hu sheep. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166:93-100

New aspects and strategies for methane mitigation from ruminants

Sanjay Kumar[a,i], Prasanta Kumar Choudhury[a], Maria Dolores Carro[d], Gareth Wyn Griffith[e], Sumit Singh Dagar[a], Monica Puniya[a], Serena Calabro[f], Sreenivas Rao Ravella[e], Tejpal Dhewa[g], Ramesh Chandra Upadhyay[b], Sunil Kumar Sirohi[c], Shivlal Singh Kundu[c] Metha Wanapat[h] and Anil Kumar Puniya[a*]

[a]Dairy Microbiology Division; [b]Dairy Cattle Physiology Division, [c]Dairy Cattle Nutrition, National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal - 132001, India

[d]Departamento de Producción Animal, ETSI Agrónomos, Ciudad Universitaria, s/n, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain

[e]Institute of Biological, Environmental and Rural Sciences, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3DD, UK

[f]Department of Animal Science and Food Control, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Napoli Federico II, via F. Delpino 1, 80137 Napoli, Italy

[g]Department of Microbiology, Bhaskarcharya College of Applied Sciences, University of Delhi, Dwarka, New Delhi - 110075, India

[h]Tropical Feed Resources Research and Development Center, Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen 40002, Thailand

[i]Biological Resource Center, Korea Research Institute of Bioscience and Biotechnology, Daejeon-305-806, Korea

[*]Corresponding author: akpuniya@gmail.com

Abstract

The growing demand for sustainable animal production is compelling researchers to explore the potential approaches to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from livestock that are mainly produced by enteric fermentation. Some potential solutions for instance, the use of chemical inhibitors to reduce methanogenesis are not feasible in routine use due to their toxicity to ruminants, inhibition of efficient rumen function or other transitory effects. Strategies, such as use of plant secondary metabolites and dietary manipulations have emerged to reduce the methane emission, but these still require extensive research before these can be recommended and deployed in the livestock industry sector. Furthermore, immunization vaccines for methanogens and phages are also under investigation for mitigation of enteric methanogenesis. The increasing knowledge of methanogenic diversity in rumen, DNA sequencing technologies and bioinformatics have paved the way for chemogenomic strategies by targeting methane producers. Chemogenomics will help in finding target enzymes and proteins, which will further assist in the screening of natural as well chemical inhibitors. The construction of a methanogenic gene catalogue through these approaches is an attainable objective. This will lead to understand the microbiome function, its relation with the host and feeds, and therefore, will form the basis of practically viable and eco-friendly methane mitigation approaches, while improving the ruminant productivity.

Keywords: Rumen; Methane Mitigation; Enteric Fermentation; Methanogens, Ruminants

Introduction

Greenhouse gas (GHGs) emission from ruminant production systems is of particular interest because of their consequences in changing the global climate. Methane comprises up to 16% of global GHGs emissions (Scheehle and Kruger 2006), and is mainly detrimental, as its warming potential is nearly 25 times greater than that of CO_2 (Zhou et al. 2011). Methane emissions from the agriculture sector represents 40% of total anthropogenic production (Key and Tallard, 2012), while enteric fermentation in ruminants makes the largest single (25%) contribution (Thorpe 2009). The emission of methane from ruminants also varies based on the geographical location (FAO 2010), feed composition and quality, feed intake, processing of feed and animal breed (Hook et al. 2010).

Apart from environmental issues, the methane emission also accounts for a 2 to 12% loss of ingested energy from the rumen (Moss et al. 2000). Such considerations have led to increased efforts in identification of newer and more effective practices to mitigate methane emissions from ruminants. Advances in understanding the gut microbial communities through genomics (Leahy et al. 2010, 2013; Attwood et al. 2011) and metagenomics (Brulc et al. 2009; Hess et al. 2011; Morgavi et al. 2013) have opened novel insights about the function of rumen ecosystem. This increased knowledge has also permitted the development of mitigation strategies to target the dominant methanogenic species directly. There have been reviews of methane abatement in recent times (Moss et al. 2000; Beauchemin et al. 2008; McAllister and Newbold 2008; Kumar et al. 2009; Eckard et al. 2010; Hook et al. 2010; Martin et al. 2010; Patra 2012; Wanapat et al. 2012), so this article will focus on the latest developments (phage

68 therapy, immunization, chemogenomics approaches), possible future directions and
69 challenges in mitigating enteric methane emissions from ruminants.

70 **Mechanism of enteric methane production**

71 Enteric methane (nearly 87%) is produced in rumen, the remainder being released from
72 fermentation in the large intestine (Lascano and Cardenas 2010). Although many factors
73 influence methane emissions from ruminants, the three major determinants are level of
74 feed intake, type of carbohydrate fed, and manipulation of rumen microflora (Johnson
75 and Johnson 1995). In rumen, the network of microbes act on feed particles to degrade
76 plant polysaccharide and produce volatile fatty acids (VFAs; mainly acetate, propionate
77 and butyrate) and gases (CO_2 and H_2) as main end products. The activity of hydrogen-
78 utilizing methanogens in rumen reduces the end product inhibition of hydrogen, thereby
79 allowing more rapid fermentation of feed. Even a small amount of hydrogen in rumen
80 can limit the oxidation of sugar, VFAs conversion and hydrogenase activity, if
81 alternative pathways for disposal are absent (McAllister and Newbold 2008). Two
82 methods utilized for disposal of reducing equivalents are the production of more highly
83 reduced VFAs and hydrogen by membrane-bound hydrogenases. However, these
84 hydrogenases have an acute sensitivity to an increased partial pressure of hydrogen
85 (Russell 2002).

86 Methane production in rumen is also affected by the passage rate of digesta in the
87 gastrointestinal tract. The rumen residence time decreases with increased feed intake,
88 thus reducing the extent of the rumen fermentation and shifting digestion from the
89 rumen to the small intestine (Aluwong et al. 2011). As a consequence, methane
90 production per unit of dry matter ingested declines, as feed intake increases

(Beauchemin and McGinn 2006a), although the total amount of methane produced is higher.

Strategies to reduce enteric methane emission

The strategies to reduce methane emission from enteric fermentation are classified into different categories and their respective mechanisms of action, problems associated with each and future prospects are shown in Table 1. The two main areas of intervention that will be reviewed here are the changes in the diet and the direct manipulation of the rumen ecosystem.

Dietary changes

Although there are many approaches to reduce methane formation in the rumen, only some of those that have been more intensively investigated during the last years will be treated here, including changes in nutrient composition, plant secondary compounds, lipid supplementation, organic acids and halogenated compounds. Other options, such as the use of ionophores, probiotics, acetogens and defaunation are listed in Table 1, but these are not described here.

Changing nutrient composition

By manipulating the nutrient composition of ruminants' diet, it is possible to reduce the enteric methane yield, the forage: concentrate ratio in the diet being one of the most studied dietary factors. A high proportion of concentrate in diet reduces rumen pH and consequently affects the protozoa population (Kumar et al. 2013a, b). Furthermore, it also reduces the acetate: propionate ratio and thus decreases the amount of methane produced per unit of feed intake (Beauchemin et al. 2008). However, the proportion of concentrates needed to bring about this effect may well be over 90% of the diet and such high levels are not desirable due to health concerns (i.e., acidosis, laminitis, liver

115 abscesses etc.; Gandra et al. 2012). Moreover, feeding high amounts of concentrates is
116 not always possible in the developing countries because of the economic constraints.
117 Therefore, developing newer forages having high soluble carbohydrates can be a better
118 option for reducing methane than feeding high-concentrate based diets. Niderkorn et al.
119 (2011) reported that diets rich in certain grass varieties such as AberAvon (*Lolium*
120 *perenne*) lead to significantly reduced methane production from *in vitro* fermentations
121 than AberStar and AberMagic under the category of water soluble carbohydrates
122 forages. Similarly, different grass and shrub species, such as *L. perenne* (Ludemann et
123 al. 2013) *Gliricidia sepium*, *Brachiaria ruziziensis* (Meale et al. 2012) and *Acacia*
124 *mangium* (Giraldo et al. 2007a), were able to reduce methane emissions. Therefore,
125 grazing on these species has been proposed as a strategy to reduce methane emissions.
126 Another approach would be the selection of better quality forages (low fibre and high
127 soluble carbohydrates content), as increased quality should result in greater productivity
128 at equivalent levels of intake and methane emissions (Clark et al. 2011).

129 ***Plants containing secondary compounds***

130 Tannins, phenolic monomers and other plant secondary metabolites are toxic to ciliate
131 protozoa, fibrolytic bacteria and methanogenic archaea, and thus may help in reducing
132 methanogenesis (Goel et al. 2005; Bhatta et al. 2009; Patra and Saxena, 2009a,b;
133 Jayanegara et al. 2011). It has been observed that condensed tannins (CT) containing
134 temperate and tropical legumes reduce methanogenesis (Lascano and Cárdenas 2010;
135 Guglielmelli et al. 2011; Calabrò et al. 2012; Cieslak et al. 2013). Tiemann et al. (2008)
136 indicated that some tropical feeds with tannins have lower fibre digestibility and
137 consequently, low hydrogen production and methane emissions. Moreover, binding of
138 tannins to proteins also reduces degradation of plant protein in the rumen and lowers

139 methanogenesis (Tavendale et al. 2005). The effects of tannin content of four different
140 vegetative stages of *Onobrychis viciifolia* were evaluated by Guglielmelli et al. (2011),
141 who found a negative correlation bordering on significance (r = -0.932; P = 0.068)
142 between CTs content and methane production, indicating that methane production
143 consistently declined as the CT content increased. The methane suppression effect of
144 CT containing legumes, such as *Lotus pedunculatus* or *Acacia mearnsii,* relative to
145 forages without tannins has been shown in sheep (Carulla et al. 2005; Ramirez-Restrepo
146 and Barry 2005), Holstein cows (Woodward et al. 2001) and goats (Hess et al. 2006;
147 Animut et al. 2008). The mechanism to decrease methanogenesis seems to vary with the
148 nature of CT, as Bhatta et al. (2013) observed that *Ficus bengalensis* and *Autocarous*
149 *integrifolis* reduced methane production due to defaunation, but *Azadirachta indica*
150 reduced methanogenesis by a direct effect on methanogens. Overall, it seems that the
151 effects of CT on rumen methanogenesis depend on the structure and concentration of
152 CT.

153 ***Supplementation of lipids***

154 Vegetables and animal lipids are originally used in ruminant rations to increase their
155 energy density. These are also considered useful in terms of reduced rumen
156 methanogenesis (Soliva et al. 2004; Beauchemin et al. 2007; Brask et al. 2013).
157 Methane production has been consistently reduced by adding fat or fatty acids to
158 ruminant diets, and it is estimated that fat can reduce methane emissions by 4-5% (g/Kg
159 DMI) for every 1% increase in the fat content of the diet (Grainger and Beauchemin,
160 2011). However, the inclusion of lipids at levels above 6-7% of dry matter intake can
161 reduce feed intake and fiber digestibility, resulting in lower milk yield or daily gain
162 (Patra 2012).

163 The addition of different oils (soya, coconut, canola, rapeseed, etc.) to ruminant diets
164 have been shown to reduce methane production between 19 and 62% in Rusitec
165 fermenters (Dohme et al. 2000), sheep (Ding et al. 2012), beef cattle (Machmüller and
166 Kreuzer, 1999; Jordan et al 2006a b) and dairy cows (Odongo et al. 2007; Brask et al.
167 2013). The mechanism of methane inhibition by fat is likely to be a combination of bio-
168 hydrogenation of unsaturated fatty acids and direct inhibition of activities of different
169 microbes including methanogens (Beauchemin et al. 2007; Kong et al. 2010; Hook et al.
170 2010). Bio-hydrogenation acts as hydrogen sink and therefore decrease rumen
171 methanogenesis, but is not the only mechanisms as there is no direct link between the
172 methane reduction and the level of unsaturation (Dohme et al. 2000) or the length of the
173 fatty acid. Medium-chain fatty acids may also reduce methanogenesis by directly acting
174 on protozoa and/or methanogens. Thus, coconut oil decreased methane production and
175 methanogens in both faunated and defaunated Rusitec fermenters, the inhibition of
176 methanogenesis caused by coconut oil being similar to that produced by defaunation
177 (Dohme et al. 1999). Comparison of the effects of different fatty acids revealed that
178 lauric, myristic and linoleic acids were the most potent reducers of methanogenesis
179 (Dohme et al. 2001; Jordan et al. 2006b; Ding et al. 2012), and the ability of lauric acid
180 to decrease cell viability of M*ethanobrevibacter ruminantium* has been recently
181 reported by Zhou et al. (2013).
182 In summary, increasing the dietary proportion of lipids may provide another feeding
183 strategy for reducing rumen methanogenesis, but the appropriate lipid and dose for each
184 dietary condition should be carefully chosen, as it has been shown that different lipid
185 sources may have similar effects on methane production but variable effects on diet
186 intake and digestion (Beauchemin et al. 2007). In the last years, the potential of

187 essential oils as additives to manipulate rumen fermentation and decrease methane
188 emissions has been extensively investigated and reviewed (Calsamiglia et al. 2007;
189 Benchaar and Greathead, 2011; Bodas et al. 2012). A wide range of essential oils
190 (derived from garlic, thyme, oregano, cinnamon, rhubarb, frangula, etc.) has been
191 shown to decrease methane production *in vitro* in a dose dependent manner, but at high
192 doses the decrease in methanogenesis was accompanied by adverse effects on
193 fermentation such as reduction in VFA production and feed digestibility (Busquet et al.,
194 2005; Patra and Yu, 2012). When used at low doses (≤300 mg/l), garlic oil and its
195 organosulfur compounds consistently decreased methane production *in vitro* without
196 negatively affecting feed fermentation (Busquet et al. 2005; Kamel et al. 2008;
197 Kongmun et al. 2010; Mateos et al. 2013), but no effects of garlic oil or its compounds
198 on methanogenesis have been observed in lactating cows (van Zijderveld et al. 2011),
199 sheep (Patra et al. 2011) or fattening bulls (Staerfl et al. 2012). The lack of response *in*
200 *vivo* is partly attributed to the adaptation of microbes (Bodas et al. 2012), but also to the
201 use of lower doses compared to those in the *in vitro* experiments. The challenge now is
202 to identify essential oils that selectively inhibit methanogenesis at concentrations that
203 can be used in the practice, with lasting effects and without depressing feed digestion
204 and animal productivity (Benchaar and Greathead, 2011).

205 ***Addition of organic acids***

206 Inclusion of organic acids (i.e. malic and fumaric) or their sodium salts in diets, results
207 in shifting rumen fermentation towards propionate and hence, less methane production.
208 The addition of sodium fumarate consistently decreased methane production *in vitro* by
209 2.3 to 41% (Ungerfeld et al. 2007), and increased feed digestibility and VFAs
210 production (García-Martínez et al. 2005; Giraldo et al. 2007b). Similarly, malate, that is

converted to fumarate in the rumen, stimulated propionate formation and also inhibited methanogenesis in some *in vitro* studies (Carro and Ranilla 2003a; Tejido et al. 2005), although other studies have failed to find clear reductions of methanogenesis *in vitro* (Carro et al. 1999; Gómez et al. 2005; Ungerfeld and Forster 2011). *In vivo* effects of adding organic acids to the diet on methane mitigation are quite variable. Wood et al. (2009) noted 60 to 76% reductions in methane emissions by supplementing fumarate at 100 g/kg to growing lambs, while Foley et al. (2009a) observed the reductions of only 6 and 16%, when the diet of beef heifers was supplemented with malic acid at 37.5 and 75 g/kg, respectively. In contrast, no effects of fumaric or malic acid on methane emissions were observed in other studies (Beauchemin and McGinn 2006b; Foley et al. 2009b).

The effect of organic acids supplementation on methane reduction appears to be influenced by the forage to concentrate ratio and the type of cereal grain being fed in diet (Carro and Ranilla 2003a, b; Gómez et al. 2005; Tejido et al. 2005), although the number of studies conducted with different diets is too low to draw definitive conclusions. However, the high cost of purified organic acids makes supplementation of ruminant diets uneconomical at the doses required to be effective. Nevertheless, diet supplementation with plant tissues naturally rich in organic acids does have some potential and it may be possible to select forages with elevated levels of other acids. Studies on lucerne, Bermuda grass and tall fescue indicated that organic acids concentrations vary not only among species but also among cultivars of the same species (Callaway et al. 1997), although it is difficult to conclude whether differences in organic acid levels among forages and cultivars are sufficient enough to affect rumen methane emission. Overall, results of fumaric and malic acid supplementation *in vitro*

234 and *in vivo* are heterogeneous, and the effectiveness of these additives seem to depend
235 on their dose and nature of diet.

236 ***Use of halogenated compounds***

237 Halogenated methane analogues, such as chloral hydrate, amichloral,
238 bromochloromethane, nitroethane and 2-nitropropanol, are potential inhibitors of
239 methane in ruminants (Nevel and Demeyer 1995). Bromochloromethane can inhibit
240 methanogenesis by reacting with coenzyme B, which functions at the last step of the
241 methanogenic pathway (McCrabb et al. 1997). Recently, Abecia et al. (2012) confirmed
242 the methane reducing effects of bromochloromethane in lactating dairy goats and
243 reported a 33% reduction with no effect on rumen bacteria, protozoa and methanogens.
244 In contrast, Denman et al. (2007) reported that bromochloromethane decreased the
245 number of methanogenic archaea in the rumen of cattle by 34% and reduced methane
246 emission by 30%. Bromochloromethane is highly volatile but can be stabilized with
247 cyclodextrin resulting in more effective reduction of enteric methane emission (May et
248 al. 1995). When fed to Braham cattle at hourly intervals, it prevented all methane
249 production (McCrabb et al. 1997) and when fed twice daily to cattle for 8 weeks, it not
250 only reduced methane by 54% but also reduced feed intake. Some compounds, such a
251 bromine analogue of coenzyme M were potent methane inhibitors in *in vitro* (Martin
252 and Macy 1985), but the inhibition was not persistent *in vivo*, suggesting adaptation of
253 methanogenic populations (Nevel and Demeyer 1995). An adaptation of methanogens
254 to quaternary ammonium compounds has also been demonstrated (Tezel et al. 2006),
255 but in contrast, no adaptation has been observed for chloroform, which decreased rumen
256 methanogenesis and methanogens without altering rumen function over a 42 day period
257 (Knight et al. 2011).

258 More recently, the effect of 3-nitrooxypropanol and ethyl-3-nitrooxypropanol on rumen
259 fermentation and methane emission have been studied using Rusitec fermenters and in
260 *in vivo* trials (Haisan et al. 2013; Martinez-Fernandez et al. 2013; Perez et al. 2013).
261 Both additives showed promising potential as methane inhibitors in the rumen with no
262 negative effects on rumen fermentation. Differences among methanogens regarding
263 their resistance to chemical inhibitors should be considered, when designing strategies
264 for inhibition of rumen methanogenesis, as selection of resistant species may result
265 (Ungerfeld et al. 2004).
266 In summary, although dietary manipulation provides many viable options, there are
267 significant variations in the effectiveness of these and currently there is not yet an
268 approach that could be practically applied. Hence, there is a need to study the influence
269 of plant components and essential oils on methane production in detail with
270 standardized samples. Based on the limited information, it can be said that benefits
271 associated with bioactive compounds *in vitro* do not always mimic *in vivo,* and *in vivo*
272 effects are usually transient in nature due to microbial adaptation. Moreover, the
273 different experimental conditions found *in vitro* and *in vivo* should be taken into account
274 when comparing doses and results from experiments. Rumen dry matter content can
275 vary with several factors, ranging from 10 to 25%, whereas dry matter content in most
276 *in vitro* systems is usually much lower (Carro et al. 2006); therefore, doses are not
277 directly comparable when expressed per diet dry matter. In addition, as pointed out by
278 Beauchemin et al. (2008), most studies on reductions in methane production from
279 ruminants due to diet management are short-term and focussed only on enteric
280 emissions, but future research should investigate long-term impacts on methane
281 emissions in the whole farm.

Microbial interventions

This section deals with the diversity of methanogens in rumen and also discusses the strategies such as usage of phages and vaccination that directly target methanogens and/ or their activities.

Methanogenic diversity

In order to target methanogens, knowledge of their population dynamics, physiology and diversity in the rumen is of utmost importance. Until recently, the rumen methanogens belonged to a few genera of the orders *Methanobacteriales*, *Methanomicrobiales* and *Methanosarcinales*, within the phylum Euryarchaeota. However, based on 16S rRNA gene sequences, a novel group distantly related to the *Thermoplasmatales* (named as rumen Cluster C; previously described as rice cluster C Thermoplasmata) was found to be highly abundant in ruminants (Jannsen and Kirs, 2008; Poulsen et al. 2013).

Methanobrevibacter is the most commonly encountered genus within *Methanobacteriales,* whereas *Methanobacterium,* that shares similar physiology as *Methanobrevibacter*, are rarely reported from rumen. Other *Methanobrevibacter* members of the order *Methanomicrobiales* have been also reported to be dominant in the rumen of buffalo (Tajima et al. 2001; Shin et al. 2004). In genus *Methanomicrobium*, *M. mobile* is mostly reported (Kumar et al. 2012) from ruminants, while other members of this genus had shown an abundance with culture independent methods, but are rarely detected/isolated with conventional approaches. The order *Methanosarcinales* comprises a group of physiologically distinct aceticlastic methanogens (Janssen, 2010), but their abundance in the rumen is low. Within this

group, *Methanococcus* spp. and *Methanosarcina* spp. are the most commonly reported (Wedlock et al. 2013).

Apart from the microbial diversity analysis, functional and sequence based metagenomics have been evolved to uncover the diversity of enzymes and metabolic pathways in the rumen. This technique has been used to identify hydrolytic enzymes of industrial applications, particularly involved in plant polysaccharide degradation. Some researchers have employed this technique and identified enzymes from the rumen of cow, buffalo, camel, reindeer and yak (Zhao et al. 2010; Hess et al. 2011, Pope et al. 2012; Dai et al. 2012; Bhatt et al. 2013). This practice is based on the availability of suitable bioassays for the enzyme of interest and presently cellulose and hemicelluloses degradation is an area of interest for rumen microbiologists. Beside enzyme bioassays, heterologous complementation of host strains and mutants as well as induction of reporter genes are used for functional metagenomic screening (Leahy et al. 2013). Pope et al. (2010) reported unique bacterial lineages underpinning plant biomass conversion, and their distinct repertoire of glycoside hydrolases in Australian macropods. They also reported the abundance of polysaccharide utilization loci in Svalbard reindeer rumen micrbome, which is much similar to the microbiome of human gut (Pope et al. 2012). Similarly, Bhatt et al. (2013) highlighted the striking similarities and differences of dromedary camel *(Camelus dromedaries*) with other animal rumen ecosystem. Since, variations of microbial communities in ruminants is of great concern, Ross et al. (2012) suggested untargeted massive parallel sequencing (sequencing without target amplification of genes) approach for resolution of variation based rumen metagenome profiling.

328 Many developments in the exploration of gut microbial communities in different animal
329 species have been made through sequence based metagenomics, and some recent
330 examples follow. Dai et al. (2012) analyzed the fibrolytic microbiome in the rumen of
331 yaks, and Brulc et al. (2009) used large sequence based studies to catalogue the genes
332 involved in fiber degradation in the bovine rumen. Qi et al. (2011) applied
333 metatranscriptomics to the study of rumen microbes function in muskox, and similar
334 work has been carried out in sheep (Cammack et al. 2013), goats (Jakhesara et al. 2010)
335 and Surti buffaloes (Singh et al. 2012a). Singh et al. (2012b) studied the virulence
336 associated and antibiotic resistance genes of rumen microbes to facilitate the
337 understanding of resistant gene transfer between and within habitats. However,
338 researchers in this area have to explore the sequence based metagenomic into taxonomic
339 perspective, as well as to link genomics and metagenomics to nutrition or other animal
340 production parameters. For example, Li et al. (2012) characterized rumen microbiota of
341 pre-ruminant calves and their metabolic potential so that the optimal early weaning
342 nutritional strategies (like milk replacer) could be formulated, and recently Ross et al.
343 (2013) analyzed the effect of methane mitigating diets on rumen microbiome.

344 ***Phage therapy***

345 The lytic potential of phages and their genes make them an important tool for methane
346 mitigation strategies. In contrast to nearly 300 phage genomes (Ackermann and
347 Kropinski 2007), only six archaeal phages are sequenced and described, and just three
348 of them are from methanogens: *Methanobacterium* phage psi M1, M2 and M100
349 (Pfister et al. 1998) and *Methanothermobacter* phage psi M100 (Luo et al. 2001). Little
350 information is currently available on the genetic blueprint and gene functionality of
351 archaeal, particularly methanogenic, phages but more are being discovered using

352 electron microscopy (Ackermann 2007) and *in vitro* techniques (Stanton 2007).
353 McAllister and Newbold (2008) reported siphophages that can infect methanogens
354 (*Methanobacter*, *Methanobrevibacter* and *Methanococcus* spp.), although these phages
355 have not been isolated from the rumen. A recent metagenomic study on phage-bacterial
356 relationships showed ≤ 0.1% relative abundance of prophage in phylum *Euryarchaeota*
357 (Berg Miller et al. 2012).
358 Metagenomic surveys are expected to reveal the presence of embedded prophages and
359 phage-like elements that would have otherwise remain unnoticed. An unanticipated
360 outcome from sequencing the *M. ruminantium* genome was the discovery of prophage
361 φ-mru having 69 phage-related proteins (Leahy et al. 2010). A gene encoding a putative
362 lytic enzyme was identified, expressed and shown to lyse *M. ruminantium*. Such lytic
363 enzyme is potentially very useful biocontrol agents for manipulating of rumen
364 methanogenic populations (Leahy et al. 2010). The genome sequence of
365 *Methanobrevibacter* AbM4 and *Methanobrevibacter boviskoreani* strain JH1 revealed
366 the presence of prophage/ phage like elements in strain JH1 while AbM4 is lacking in
367 gene encoding prophage (Lee at al. 2013a and Leahy et al. 2013). Phages are host and
368 even strain specific, so phage-based methane mitigation strategies could be developed
369 without affecting other phylogenetically distinct microbes in the rumen. However, hosts
370 and phages are also known to be involved in a rapid evolutionary race as the host
371 changes to avoid infection and the phage changes to maintain infectivity.
372 In combination with the application of other phage enzymes and structural components,
373 a rotation system can be envisioned that may overcome the rapid adaptation
374 mechanisms of microbes to phage challenges. More methanogenic phages need to be
375 identified, sequenced and characterized to identify and employ such phage-based

strategies. However, high specificity of phages may also be a limiting factor in their effectiveness in reducing methane emissions, since there appears to be a high diversity of methanogens in rumen (Janssen and Kirs 2008). Finally, either mixture of phages or structural components of phages may prove useful against the greater diversity of methanogens in rumen.

Immunization

Host immunization commonly offers a diverse and ecofriendly solution to the problems especially associated with animal health. Therefore, developing vaccines against methanogens appears to be an alternative and attractive approach, which can avoid many of the issues mentioned above related to methane mitigation from ruminants. Wright et al. (2004) developed two vaccines, VF3 (based on three methanogenic strains 1Y, AK-87 and ZA-10) and VF7 (based on seven methanogens), that produced a 7.7% methane reduction in sheep (g per kg of dry matter intake); despite targeting only a minority (20%) of methanogens present within these host animals. They also created a vaccine based on five methanogens (*Methanobrevibacter s*pp. strains 1Y, AK-87, *M. millerae* ZA-10, *Methanomicrobium mobile* BP and *Methanosphaera stadtmanae* MCB-3) that was administered in three vaccinations to sheep (Williams et al. 2009). Surprisingly, immunization with this second vaccine caused methane output to increase by 18%, despite the fact that a larger proportion of the methanogenic population (52%) was targeted. Thus, further work is needed to optimize the individual components of these vaccines such that the most potent methanogens are specifically targeted.

Researchers believe that anti-methanogenic vaccines will only yield the short term reductions in methanogens and/ or methanogenesis, due to the possible proteolytic degradation and low persistence of host antibodies in rumen (Li et al. 2007; Cook et al.

400 2008; Lascano and Cárdenas 2010). Vaccination of sheep with entodinial or mixed
401 protozoa antigens reduced protozoa and the released IgG antibodies against rumen
402 protozoa remained active and continued to bind the target cells up to 8 hours (Williams
403 et al. 2008). Vaccines targeting single surface antigens may not be effective, as
404 methanogenic archaea differs largely based on their host, diet as well as geographical
405 regions (Zhou et al. 2009). A new vaccine has been developed using sub-cellular
406 fractions (cytoplasmic and cell wall derived protein) of *Methanobrevibacter*
407 *ruminantium* M1 (Wedlock et al. 2010). Twenty sheep were vaccinated, then booster
408 doses were given after three weeks, and the antisera were found to agglutinate and
409 decrease the growth of archaeal methanogens and methane production *in vitro*.
410 *In vivo* efficacy of the vaccine on methanogens is yet to be evaluated. Based on liquid
411 chromatography mass spectrometer, it was reported that most of the proteins were
412 intracellular enzymes, particularly methyl-coenzyme M reductase, and these
413 intracellular proteins would not be suitable as vaccine antigens owing to their
414 inaccessibility for antibody binding. Since, there is the growing database for the genome
415 sequences of rumen methanogens, the possibility of finding new target antigens/
416 proteins using comparative and pangenomics analysis have increased. The genome
417 based reverse vaccine approach may also help in mining the new vaccine targets that
418 might prove successful for efficacious vaccination against methanogens. Furthermore,
419 extensive research is needed to identify adjuvants that stimulate high titer of antibody
420 and are suitable for formulating with protein antigens to produce a low-cost and
421 effective vaccine.
422 Overall, the genome sequencing will be leading to the better understandings toward
423 methanogenic interactions with other microbes in the rumen suggesting some methane

mitigation possibilities. The genomic techniques have provided positive clues for probable vaccine targets of methanogens in the rumen. Such approaches in future will optimistically lead to methane reducing practices for farm animals. However, the vaccine based inhibition method will have to pass the regulatory systems to guaranty animal health.

Chemogenomics: An upcoming strategy

Genome sequencing of microbes is actually a useful technique that can provide information directly applicable to methane mitigation strategies from ruminants, based either on vaccines development or small molecule inhibitor practices. Further, it can help to identify methane inhibitors by predicting and/or determining specific enzyme structures. This can define the geometry of the enzyme's active site and help to design the molecules that fit exactly into the active site and hence, can inhibit/ block the enzyme's catalytic function. This approach identifies inhibitory molecules that can be tested for their effectiveness in animal trials.

For reaching to a realistic solution to the problem of methane emissions, the technologies for reducing enteric methane must effectively target all the rumen methanogens (major and minor groups), otherwise less abundant methanogens may occupy the vacated niches and lead to normal methanogenesis. Besides, they should not affect other microbes present in the rumen, so that rumen function would not be altered. For this, an understanding of the diversity and physiology of rumen methanogens is essentially required, that not only identifies the dominant methanogens in a particular geographical area, but also the conserved sequences that can be targeted. In this regard, more genome sequences of methanogens are required to validate that the targets are common and effective among all the methanogens in the rumen (Attwood et al. 2011).

448 The completed *M. ruminantium* genome and draft sequences from other rumen
449 methanogenic species are paving the way for identification of the underlying cellular
450 mechanisms that define these microbes, leading to a better understanding of their micro-
451 ecology within the rumen. Aside from this, the genome sequence of *M. ruminantium*,
452 draft genome sequence of *M. boviskoreani* strain JH1 from Korean native cattle
453 (HanWoo) and AbM4 from abomasum's of sheep have been published (Lee et al.
454 2013a; Leahy et al. 2013). The strain AbM4 do not code for many adhesion-like
455 proteins, which indicates that it invest less on the external interactions with its
456 environment compared to strain JH1. Moreover, AbM4 has a broader repertoire of
457 cofactors and coenzymes, which shows its lesser dependence on the other rumen
458 microbes and CoM in the medium. On the contrary, strain JH1 showed very good
459 growth in presence of both CoM and VFA in the medium, and had genes and enzymes
460 for CO_2 plus hydrogen, as well as for formate utilization, so that these enzymes possibly
461 can be targeted for inhibition of methanogenesis.
462 Another gene, which can be further targeted, is the membrane associated transpeptidase.
463 The Mtr enzyme complex can also be used for the development of vaccines. The
464 phylogenetic analysis using Maximum-Likelihood inference method (MEGA 5.1) with
465 1000 boot strapping, and genomic sequence shows that strain JH1 and AbM4 likely
466 belong to the same species and is related to *M. wolinii*. At present, this research is
467 mainly at exploratory stage but several promising leads for chemogenomic targets are
468 being investigated as possible intervention points for the inhibition of rumen
469 methanogens. The cellular studies indicate that many of the conserved enzyme targets
470 are involved in energy generation via methanogenesis, while majority of the conserved
471 surface protein targets are of unknown function.

Bioinformatic approaches used for the inhibitor prediction against F420 dependent NADP oxidoreductase enzyme that catalyzes an important electron transfer step in the methanogenesis from *Methanobrevibacter smithii* reveal that lovastatin and compactin had high affinity to the enzyme and can act as potential inhibitors (Sharma et al. 2011). Both *in silico* approaches and *in vitro* enzyme assays may be useful for screening chemical inhibitors of methanogenesis.

The analysis of more genome sequences of rumen methanogens would help to identify potential methane inhibitors. According to the recent report of Lee et al. (2013a, b), only very few rumen methanogens are cultured as pure isolates and 13 genome projects are completed as yet (Leahy et al. 2013; Morgavi et al. 2013). Most of these genome sequences are from genus *Methanobrevibacter*, which is considered to be dominating rumen methanogen, as per the global data set of rumen microbes (Jansen and Kirs, 2008; Jeyanathan et al. 2011; Cheng et al. 2009; Williams et al. 2009, Zhou et al. 2009). In near future, with the development of "Hungate1000", a catalogue of 1000 reference microbial genomes from the rumen (http://www.hungate1000.org.nz/), genomic dataset of rumen microbiome will be numerically high, thereby more targets for anti-methanogenic strategies can be identified and used for improving the animal health, productivity and beyond. Furthermore, single-cell isolation technique from the complex rumen community would provide more advantage, over isolation approach, and their whole genome sequencing can be accomplished later.

Researchers are currently investigating, whether animal variation in methane emission is controlled by a heritable characteristic. Although clear and persistent individual differences in methane emissions have been found among animals fed the same diet (Pinares-Patiño et al. 2003, 2011; Martínez et al. 2010), it has not been yet clearly

established whether the low emission trait is associated with any unwanted side effects. Currently, it is not possible to say whether in future it will be possible to breed animals that produce lesser methane per unit of intake or not (Clark 2013). Overall, the chemogenomics allowed us to identify the key features of rumen methanogens that can be targeted to inhibit them and to mitigate enteric methane production, eventually reducing the release of anthropogenic GHGs in the environment.

Final remarks

Looking at the facts in a comprehensive manner, profiling of rumen methanogens seem to be an important tool for ensuring sustainability of ruminant based agriculture production systems. However, for successful methane mitigation strategies to be developed and adopted, a thorough understanding of the microbial ecology of rumen methanogens is essentially required. DNA-based microbial profiling to explore ruminant methane mitigation will support how the rumen microbes can be manipulated without hampering the animal's production potential. These approaches would identify the involved microbial species based on genome sequences. By comparing microbial profiles of animals, one can identify the microbial shifts in response to the methane mitigation strategies. Some of the dietary strategies used in different studies have produced changes in rumen microbial communities as revealed by profiling assays. The comparison of rumen microflora both in high and low methane producers will help in determining if the changes in the microbiota can be directly or indirectly linked to the reduced methane emissions (Ross et al. 2013). In addition, genetic improvement and management practices for increasing ruminant productivity and abating methane emissions, in conjunction with other strategies, can also play an important role in lowering enteric methane emissions globally. Finally, it must be taken into account that

there should be some economic return to the producers, if strategies to reduce methane emissions are expected to be implemented at farm level, and that any adopted strategy should also ensure animal health, food security and environmental safety.

Acknowledgements

We thankfully acknowledge the DBT-CREST fellowship 2011-12 to Anil K Puniya for visiting Aberystwyth University (UK) that greatly helped in developing the manuscript in collaboration with our overseas experts. We are also thankful to NICRA and VTCC ongoing network programmes at NDRI (ICAR), Karnal (India) for providing the necessary support for writing the manuscript.

References

Abecia L, Toral PG, Martín-García AI, Martínez G, Tomkins NW, Molina-Alcaide E, Newbold CJ, Yáñez-Ruiz DR (2012) Effect of bromochloromethane on methane emission, rumen fermentation pattern, milk yield, and fatty acid profile in lactating dairy goats. J Dairy Sci 95:2027-2036

Ackermann HW (2007) 5500 Phages examined in the electron microscope. Arch Virol 152:227-243

Ackermann HW, Kropinski AM (2007) Curated list of prokaryote viruses with fully sequenced genomes**.** Res Microbiol 158:555-566

Aluwong T, Wuyep P, Allam L (2011) Livestock-environment interactions: Methane emissions from ruminants. Afr J Biotechnol 10:1265-1269

Animut G, Puchala R, Goetsch A, Patra A, Sahlu T, Varel V, Wells J (2008) Methane emission by goats consuming diets with different levels of condensed tannins from lespedeza. Anim Feed Sci Technol 144: 212-227

543 Attwood G, McSweeney C (2008) Methanogen genomics to discover targets for
544 methane mitigation technologies and options for alternative H_2 utilization in the
545 rumen. Aust J Exp Agr 48:28-37
546 Attwood GT, Altermann E, Kelly WJ, Leahy SC, Zhang L, Morrison M (2011)
547 Exploring rumen methanogen genomes to identify targets for methane mitigation
548 strategies. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166:65-75
549 Beauchemin K, Kreuzer M, O'mara F, McAllister T (2008) Nutritional management for
550 enteric methane abatement: a review. Aust J Exp Agr 48:21-27
551 Beauchemin K, McGinn SM, Petit HV (2007) Methane abatement strategies for cattle:
552 lipid supplementation of diets. Can J Anim Sci 87:431-440
553 Beauchemin KA, McGinn SM (2006a) Enteric methane emissions from growing beef
554 cattle as affected by diet and level of intake. Can J Anim Sci 86:401-408
555 Beauchemin KA, McGinn SM (2006b) Methane emissions from beef cattle: Effects of
556 fumaric acid, essential oil, and canola oil. J Anim Sci 84:1489-1496
557 Benchaar C, Greathead H (2011) Essential oils and opportunities to mitigate enteric
558 methane emissions from ruminants. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:338-355
559 Berg Miller ME, Yeoman CJ, Chia N, Tringe SG, Angly FE, Edwards RA, Flint HJ,
560 Lamed R, Bayer EA, White BA (2012) Phage–bacteria relationships and CRISPR
561 elements revealed by a metagenomic survey of the rumen microbiome Environ
562 Microbiol 14(1):207-227
563 Bhatt VD, Dande SS, Patil NV, Joshi CG (2013) Molecular analysis of the bacterial
564 microbiome in the forestomach fluid from the dromedary camel (*Camelus*
565 *dromedaries*) Mol Biol Rep 40:3363-3371

566 Bhatta R, Saravanan M, Baruah L, Dhali A, Kolte A, Prasad CS (2013) Effect of graded
567 levels of tropical leaves containing-seconday metabolites on rumen fermentation
568 pattern, protozoa population and methanogenesis *in vitro.* Advances in Animal
569 Biosciences 4 (2) pp 307
570 Bhatta R, Uyeno Y, Tajima K, Takenaka A, Yabumoto Y, Nonaka I, Enishi O, Kurihara
571 M (2009) Difference in nature of tannins on in vitro ruminal methane and volatile
572 fatty acid production and on methanogenic archaea and protozoal populations. J
573 Dairy Sci 92:5512–5522.
574 Bird SH, Hegarty R, Woodgate R (2010) Modes of transmission of rumen protozoa
575 between mature sheep. Anim Prod Sci 50:414-417
576 Bodas R, Prieto N, García-González R, Andrés S, Giráldez FJ, López S (2012)
577 Manipulation of rumen fermentation and methane production with plant secondary
578 metabolites. Anim Feed Sci Technol 176:78-93
579 Brask M, Lund P, Weisbjerg MR, Hellwing AL, Poulsen M, Larsen MK, Hvelplund T
580 (2013) Methane production and digestion of different physical forms of rapeseed as
581 fat supplement in dairy cows. J Dairy Sci 96:2356-2365
582 Brulc JM, Antonopoulos DA, Rincon MT, Band M, Bari A, Akraiko T, Hernandez A,
583 Thimmapuram J, Henrissat B, Coutinho PM, Borovok I, Jindou S, Lamed R, Flint
584 HJ, Bayer EA, White BA (2009) Gene-centric metagenomics of the fibre-adherent
585 bovine rumen microbiome reveals forage specific glycoside hydrolases. Proc Natl
586 Acad Sci USA 106:1948-1953
587 Busquet M, Calsamiglia S, Ferret A, Carro MD, Kamel C (2005) Effect of garlic oil and
588 four of its compounds on rumen microbial fermentation. J Dairy Sci 88:4393-4404

589 Calabrò S, Cutrignelli MI, Guglielmelli A, Tudisco R, Piccolo V, Grossi M, Infascelli F
590 (2012) *In vitro* methane production from different feeds. Proc. 1st Int. Conf. on
591 Animal Nutrition and Environment, Sep. 14-15, Khon Kaen (Thailand), pp109-112
592 Callaway T, Martin S, Wampler J, Hill N, Hill G (1997) Malate content of forage
593 varieties commonly fed to cattle. J Dairy Sci 80:1651-1655
594 Calsamiglia S, Busquet M, Cardozo P, Castillejos L, Ferret A (2007) Invited review:
595 essential oils as modifiers of rumen microbial fermentation. J Dairy Sci 90: 2580-
596 2595
597 Cammack KM, Ellison MJ, Conant GC, Austin KJ, Lamberson WR (2013) Effect of
598 diet type and feed efficiency status on rumen microbial populations in sheep. In 5th
599 Greenhouse Gases and Animal Agriculture Conference, p. 372. Dublin, Ireland:
600 Cambridge University Press.
601 Carro MD, Lebzien P, Rohr K (1992) Influence of yeast culture on the "in vitro"
602 fermentation (Rusitec) of diets containing variable portions of concentrates. Anim
603 Feed Sci Technol 37:209-220
604 Carro MD, López S, Valdés C, Ovejero FJ (1999) Effect of DL-malate on mixed
605 ruminal microorganism fermentation using the rumen simulation technique
606 (RUSITEC). Anim Feed Sci Technol 79:279-288
607 Carro MD, Ranilla MJ (2003a) Effect of the addition of malate on *in vitro* rumen
608 fermentation of cereal grains. Br J Nutr 89:181-188
609 Carro MD, Ranilla MJ (2003b) Influence of different concentrations of disodium
610 fumarate on methane production and fermentation of concentrate feeds by rumen
611 micro-organisms *in vitro*. Br J Nutr 90:617-623

612 Carro MD, Ranilla MJ, Giráldez FJ, Mantecón AR (2006) Effects of malate
613 supplementation on feed intake, digestibility, microbial protein synthesis and plasma
614 metabolites in lambs fed a high-concentrate diet. J Anim Sci 84:405-410
615 Carulla JE, Kreuzer M, Machmüller A, Hess HD (2005) Supplementation of *Acacia*
616 *mearnsii* tannins decreases methanogenesis and urinary nitrogen in forage-fed
617 sheep. Aust J Agr Res 56:961-970
618 Cheng YF, Edwards JE, Allison GG, Zhu W-Y, Theodorou MK (2009) Diversity and
619 activity of enriched ruminal cultures of anaerobic fungi and methanogens grown
620 together on lignocellulose in consecutive batch culture. Bioresour Technol
621 100:4821–4828
622 Cieslak A, Szumacher-Strabel M, Stochmal A, Oleszek W (2013) Plant components
623 with specific activities against rumen methanogens. Animal 7:253-265.
624 Clark H (2013) Nutritional and host effects on methanogenesis in the grazing ruminant.
625 Animal 7:41-48
626 Clark H, Kelliher F, Pinares-Patino C (2011) Reducing CH_4 emissions from grazing
627 ruminants in New Zealand: challenges and opportunities. Asian-Aust J Anim Sci
628 24:295–302
629 Cook S, Maiti P, Chaves A, Benchaar C, Beauchemin K, McAllister T (2008) Avian
630 (IgY) anti-methanogen antibodies for reducing ruminal methane production: *in vitro*
631 assessment of their effects. Aust J Exp Agr 48:260-264
632 Dai X, Zhu Yaxin, Luo Y, Song L, Liu D, Liu L, Chen F, Wang M,, Li J, Zeng X, Dong
633 Z, Hu S, Li L, Xu J, Huang L, Dong X (2012) Metagenomic insights into the
634 fibrolytic microbiome in yak rumen. PLoS ONE 7(7):e40430

635 Denman SE, Tomkins NW, McSweeney CS (2007) Quantitation and diversity analysis
636 of ruminal methanogenic populations in response to the anti-methanogenic
637 compound bromochloromethane. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 62:313-322
638 Ding X, Long R, Zhang Q, Huang X, Guo X, Mi J (2012) Reducing methane emissions
639 and the methanogen population in the rumen of Tibetan sheep by dietary
640 supplementation with coconut oil. Trop Anim Health Pro 44:1541-1545
641 Dohme F, Machmuller A, Estermann BL, Pfister P, Wasserfallen A, Kreuzer M (1999)
642 The role of the rumen ciliate protozoa for methane suppression caused by coconut
643 oil. Lett Appl Microbiol 29:187-192
644 Dohme F, Machmüller A, Wasserfallen A, Kreuzer M (2000) Comparative efficiency of
645 various fats rich in medium-chain fatty acids to suppress ruminal methanogenesis as
646 measured with RUSITEC. Can J Anim Sci 80:473-484
647 Dohme F, Machmüller A, Wasserfallen A, Kreuzer M (2001) Ruminal methanogenesis
648 as influenced by individual fatty acids supplemented to complete ruminant diets.
649 Lett Appl Microbiol 32:47-51
650 Eckard R, Grainger C, De Klein C (2010) Options for the abatement of methane and
651 nitrous oxide from ruminant production: A review. Livest Sci 130: 47-56
652 FAO (2010) Greenhouse gas emissions from the dairy sector. A life cycle assessment.
653 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy
654 Foley P, Kenny D, Callan J, Boland T, O'mara F (2009a) Effect of DL-malic acid
655 supplementation on feed intake, methane emission, and rumen fermentation in beef
656 cattle. J Anim Sci 87:1048-1057

657 Foley PA, Kenny DA, Lovett DK, Callan JJ, Boland TM, O'Mara FP (2009b) Effect of
658 dl-malic acid supplementation on feed intake, methane emissions, and performance
659 of lactating dairy cows at pasture. J Dairy Sci 92:3258-3264
660 Fonty G, Joblin K, Chavarot M, Roux R, Naylor G, Michallon F (2007) Establishment
661 and development of ruminal hydrogenotrophs in methanogen-free lambs. Appl
662 Environ Microbiol 73:6391-6403
663 Gandra JR, nunes Gil PC, Consolo NRB, Gandra ERS, Gobesso AAO (2012) Addition
664 of increasing doses of ricinoleic acid from castor oil (*Ricinus communis* L.) in dites
665 of Nellore steers in feedlots. J Anim Feed Sci 21:566-576.
666 García-Martínez R, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2005) Effects of disodium
667 fumarate on in vitro rumen microbial growth, methane production and fermentation
668 of diets differing in their forage:concentrate ratio. Br J Nutr 94:71-77
669 Giraldo LA, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2007a) Efecto de la sustitución de
670 *Brachiaria dictyoneura* or *Acacia mangium* sobre la fermentación ruminal *in vitro*
671 (Effects of substitution of *Brachiaria dictyoneura* by *Acacia mangium*on *in vitro*
672 ruminal fermentation). Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Pecuarias 29:39-46
673 Giraldo LA, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2007b) Influence of exogenous
674 fibrolytic enzyme and fumarate on methane production, microbial growth and
675 fermentation in Rusitec fermenters. Br J Nutr 98:753-761
676 Goel G, Puniya AK, Aguilar, CN, Singh K (2005) Interaction of gut microflora with
677 tannins in feeds. Naturwissenschaften 92:497–503
678 Gómez JA, Tejido ML, Carro MD (2005) Mixed rumen microorganisms growth and
679 rumen fermentation of two diets in RUSITEC fermenters: influence of disodium
680 malate supplementation. Br J Nutr 93:479-484

681 Grainger C, Beauchemin KA (2011) Can enteric methane emissions from ruminants be
682 lowered without lowering their production? Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:308-
683 320
684 Guglielmelli A, Calabrò S, Primi R, Carone F, Cutrignelli MI, Tudisco R, Piccolo G,
685 Ronchi B, Danieli PP (2011) *In vitro* fermentation patterns and methane production
686 of sainfoin (*Onobrychis viciifolia* Scop.) hay with different condensed tannin
687 contents. Grass and Forage Science 66:488-500
688 Haisan J, Sun Y, Beauchemin K, Guan L, Duval S, Barreda DR, Oba M (2013) Effects
689 of feeding 3-nitrooxypropanol, at varying levels, on methane emissions and rumen
690 fermentation in lactating dairy cows. Advances in Animal Biosciences 4 (2) pp 326
691 Hegarty R, Bird S, Vanselow B, Woodgate R (2010) Effects of the absence of
692 protozoa from birth or from weaning on the growth and methane production of
693 lambs. Br J Nutr 100:1220-1227
694 Hess H, Tiemann T, Noto F, Carulla J, Kreuzer M (2006) Strategic use of tannins as
695 means to limit methane emission from ruminant livestock, International Congress
696 Series Elsevier, pp164-167
697 Hess M, Sczybra A, Egan R, Kim TW, Chokhawala H, Schroth G, Luo S, Clark DS,
698 Chen F, Zhang T, Mackie RI, Pennacchio LA, Tringe SG, Visel A, Woyke T, Wang
699 Z, Rubin EM (2011) Metagenomic discovery of biomass-degrading genes and
700 genomes from cow rumen. Science 331:463-467
701 Holtshausen L, Chaves A, Beauchemin K, McGinn S, McAllister T, Odongo N, Cheeke
702 P, Benchaar C (2008) Feeding saponin-containing *Yucca schidigera* and *Quillaja*
703 *saponaria* to decrease enteric methane production in dairy cows. J Dairy Sci
704 92:2809-2821

705 Hook SE, Northwood KS, Wright AD, McBride BW (2009) Long-term monensin
706 supplementation does not significantly affect the quantity or diversity of
707 methanogens in the rumen of the lactating dairy cow. Appl Environ Microbiol
708 75:374-380
709 Hook SE, Wright AD, McBride BW (2010) Methanogens: methane producers of the
710 rumen and mitigation strategies. Hindawi Publishing Corporation. Archaea. Article
711 ID 945785. doi:10.1155/2010/945785
712 Jakhesara S, Koringa P, Ramani U, Ahir V, Tripathi A, Soni P, Singh K, Bhatt V, Patel
713 J., Patel M (2010) Comparative study of tannin challenged rumen microbiome in
714 goat using high throughput sequencing technology. Developmental Microbiology
715 and Molecular Biology 1: 95-106
716 Janssen PH (2010) Influence of hydrogen on rumen methane formation and
717 fermentation balances through microbial growth kinetics and fermentation
718 thermodynamics. Anim Feed Sci Technol 160:1-22
719 Janssen PH, Kirs M (2008) Structure of the archaeal community of the rumen. Appl
720 Environ Microbiol 74:3619-3625
721 Jayanegara FL, Kreuzer M (2011) Meta-analysis of the relationship between dietary
722 tannin level and methane formation in ruminants from *in vivo* and *in vitro*
723 experiments. J Anim Physiol Anim Nutr (Berl) 96(3):365-75
724 Jeyanathan J, Kirs M, Rominus RS, Hoskin SO, Jassen PH (2011) Methanogen
725 community structure in the rumens of farmed sheep, cattle and red deer fed different
726 diets. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 74:311-326
727 Joblin K (1999) Ruminal acetogens and their potential to lower ruminant methane
728 emissions. Aust J Agr Res 50:1307-1313

729 Joblin K (2005) Methanogenic archaea, In: Makker, H, McSweeney, C. (Eds.), Methods
730 in gut microbial ecology for ruminants, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp 47-53
731 Johnson K, Johnson DE (1995) Methane emissions from cattle. J Anim Sci 73:2483-
732 2492
733 Jordan E, Kenny D, Hawkins M, Malone R, Lovett D, O'Mara F (2006a) Effect of
734 refined soy oil or whole soybeans on intake, methane output, and performance of
735 young bulls. J Anim Sci 84:2418-2425
736 Jordan E, Lovett D, Monahan F, Callan J, Flynn B, O'Mara F (2006b) Effect of refined
737 coconut oil or copra meal on methane output and on intake and performance of beef
738 heifers. J Anim Sci 84:162-170
739 Kamel C, Greathead HMR, Tejido ML, Ranilla MJ, Carro MD (2008) Effect of allicin
740 and diallyldisulfide on *in vitro* rumen fermentation of a mixed diet. Anim Feed Sci
741 Technol 145:351-363
742 Kamra DN, Pawar M, Singh B (2012) Effect of plant secondary metabolites on rumen
743 methanogens and methane emissions by ruminants. Dietary Phytochemicals and
744 Microbes, pp 351-370
745 Key N, Tallard G (2012) Mitigating methane emissions from livestocks: a global
746 analysis of sector policies. Clim Change 112:387-414
747 Knight T, Ronimus RS, Dey D, Tootill C, Naylor G, Evans P, Molano G, Smith A,
748 Tavendale M, Pinares-Patino CS, Clark H (2011) Chloroform decreases rumen
749 methanogenesis and methanogen populations without altering rumen function in
750 cattle. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:101-112

751 Kong Y, He M, McAlister T, Seviour R, Forster R (2010) Quantitative fluorescence *in*
752 *situ* hybridization of microbial communities in the rumens of cattle fed different
753 diets. Appl Environ Microbiol 76(20):6933–6938
754 Kongmun P, Wanapat M, Pakdee P, Navanukraw C (2010) Effect of coconut oil and
755 garlic powder on in vitro fermentation using gas production technique. Livest Sci
756 127:38-44
757 Kumar S, Dagar SS and Puniya AK (2012) Isolation and characterization of
758 methanogens from rumen of Murrah buffalo. Ann Microbiol 62:345-350
759 Kumar S, Dagar SS, Puniya AK, Upadhyay RC, (2013a) Changes in methane emission,
760 rumen fermentation in response to diet and microbial interactions. Res Vet Sci
761 94:263-268
762 Kumar S, Dagar SS, Sirohi SK, Upadhyay RC, Puniya AK (2013b) Microbial profiles,
763 *in vitro* gas production, dry matter digestibility based on various ratios of roughage
764 to concentrate. Ann Microbiol 63:541–545
765 Kumar S, Puniya AK, Puniya M, Dagar S, Sirohi S, Singh K, Griffith G (2009) Factors
766 affecting rumen methanogens and methane mitigation strategies. World J Microbiol
767 Biotechnol 25:1557-1566
768 Lascano CE, Cárdenas E (2010) Alternatives for methane emission mitigation in
769 livestock systems. Rev Bras Zootecn 39:175-182
770 Leahy SC, Kelly WJ, Altermann E, Ronimus RS, Yeoman CJ, Pacheco DM, Li D,
771 Kong Z, McTavish S, Sang C (2010) The genome sequence of the rumen
772 methanogen *Methanobrevibacter ruminantium* reveals new possibilities for
773 controlling ruminant methane emissions. PLoS One 5:e8926

774 Leahy SC, Kelly WJ, Li D, Altermann E, Lambie SC, Cox F, Attwood GT (2013) The
775 complete genome sequence of *Methanobrevibacter* sp. AbM4. Stand Genomic Sci
776 8:2
777 Lee J-H, Kumar S, Lee G-H, Chang D-H, Rhee M-S, , Kim D-S, Yoon M-H, Kim B-C
778 (2013b) *Methanobrevibacter boviskoreani* sp. nov., isolated from the rumen of
779 Korean native cattle. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol (In Press) doi 10.1007/s13213-012-
780 0501-0
781 Lee J-H, Rhee M-S, Kumar S, Lee G-H, Chang D-H, Kim D-S, Choi S-H, Lee D-W,
782 Kim B-C (2013a) Genome sequence of *Methanobrevibacter* sp. strain JH1, isolated
783 from rumen of Korean native cattle. Genome Announc 1:e00002-13
784 Li RW, Connor EE, Li C, Baldwin RL, Sparks ME (2012) Characterization of the
785 rumen microbiota of pre-ruminant calves using metagenomic tools. Environ
786 Microbiol 14(1):129-139
787 Li XY, Jin LJ, McAllister TA, Stanford K, Xu JY, Lu YN, Zhen YH, Sun YX, Xu YP
788 (2007) Chitosan-alginate microcapsules for oral delivery of egg yolk
789 immunoglobulin (IgY). J Agric Food Chem 55, 2911-2917
790 Ludemann CI, Eckard RJ, Smith KF (2013) Potential effects of time of cutting and plant
791 genotypes and gas production from fermentation of perennial ryegrass (*Lolium*
792 *perenne*) using dairy cow rumen. Advances in Animal Biosciences 4(2) pp 424
793 Lunsin R, Wanapat M, Yuangklang C, Rowlinson P (2012) Effect of rice bran oil
794 supplementation on rumen fermentation, milk yield and milk composition in
795 lactating dairy cows. Livest Sci 145:167-173

796 Luo Y, Pfister P, Leisinger T, Wasserfallen A (2001) The Genome of archaeal prophage
797 ψm100 encodes the lytic enzyme responsible for autolysis of *Methanothermobacter*
798 *wolfeii*. J Bacteriol 183:5788-5792
799 Lynch H, Martin S (2002) Effects of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* culture and
800 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* live cells on *in vitro* mixed ruminal microorganism
801 fermentation. J Dairy Sci 85, 2603-2608
802 Machmüller A, Kreuzer M (1999) Methane suppression by coconut oil and associated
803 effects on nutrient and energy balance in sheep. Can J Anim Sci 79:65-72
804 Martin C, Morgavi DP, Doreau M (2010) Methane mitigation in ruminants: From
805 microbe to the farm scale. Animal 4:351-365
806 Martin S, Nisbet D (1990) Effects of Aspergillus oryzae fermentation extract on
807 fermentation of amino acids, bermudagrass and starch by mixed ruminal
808 microorganisms *in vitro*. J Anim Sci 68:2142-2149
809 Martin SA, Macy J (1985) Effects of monensin, pyromellitic diimide and 2-
810 bromoethanesulfonic acid on rumen fermentation *in vitro*. J Anim Sci 60:544
811 Martin SA, Streeter M (1995) Effect of malate on *in vitro* mixed ruminal
812 microorganism fermentation. J Anim Sci 73:2141-2145
813 Martínez ME, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Ramos S, Carro MD (2010) The effect of the diet
814 fed to donor sheep on *in vitro* methane production and ruminal fermentation of diets
815 of variable composition. Anim Feed Sci Technol 158:126–135
816 Martinez-Fernndez G, Arco A, Abecia L, Cantalapiedra-Hijar G, Moline-Alcaide E,
817 Martin-Garcia AI, Kindermann M, Duval S, Yanez-ruiz DR (2013) The addition of
818 Ethyl-3-nitrooxy propionate and 3-Nitrooxypropanol in the diet of sheep

substantially reduces methane emissions and the effect persists over a month. Advances in Animal Biosciences 4 (2) pp 368

Mateos I, Ranilla MJ, Tejido ML, Saro C, Kamel C, Carro MD (2013) The influence of diet on the effectiveness of garlic oil and cinnamaldehyde to manipulate *in vitro* ruminal fermentation and methane production. Anim Prod Sci. 53:299-307

Mathieu F, Jouany JP, Senaud J, Bohatier J, Bertin G, Mercier M (1996) The effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Aspergillus oryzae* on fermentations in the rumen of faunated and defaunated sheep; protozoal and probiotic interactions. Reprod Nutr Devel 36:271-287

May C, Payne AL, Stewart PL, Edgar JA (1995) A delivery system for agents, In: International Patent Application No. PCT/AU95/00733

McAllister TA, Newbold CJ (2008) Redirecting rumen fermentation to reduce methanogenesis. Aust J Exp Agr 48:7-13

McCrabb GJ, Berger KT, Magner T, May C, Hunter RA (1997) Inhibiting methane production in Brahman cattle by dietary supplementation with a novel compound and the effects on growth. Aust J Agr Res 48:323-329

Meale S, Chaves A, Baah J, McAllister T (2012) Methane production of different forages in *in vitro* ruminal fermentation. Asian Austral J Anim Sci 25:86-91

Morgavi DP, Jouany JP, Martin C (2008) Changes in methane emission and rumen fermentation parameters induced by refaunation in sheep. Aust J Exp Agr 48:69-72

Morgavi DP, Kelly WJ, Janssen PH, Attwood GT (2013) Rumen microbial (meta)genomics and its application to ruminant production. Animal 7:184-201.

Moss AR, Jouany JP, Newbold J (2000) Methane production by ruminants: its contribution to global warming. Ann Zootech 49:231-254

843 Nevel CV, Demeyer D (1995) Feed additives and other interventions for decreasing
844 methane emissions. Biotech Anim Feeds Anim Feeding 17:329-349
845 Newbold C, McIntosh F, Wallace R (1998) Changes in the microbial population of a
846 rumen-simulating fermenter in response to yeast culture. Can J Anim Sci 78:241-
847 244
848 Niderkorn V, Baumont R, Le Morvan A, Macheboeuf D (2011) Occurrence of
849 associative effects between grasses and legumes in binary mixtures on *in vitro*
850 rumen fermentation characteristics. J Anim Sci 89:1138-1145
851 Odongo N, Or-Rashid M, Kebreab E, France J, McBride B (2007) Effect of
852 supplementing myristic acid in dairy cow rations on ruminal methanogenesis and
853 fatty acid profile in milk. J Dairy Sci 90:1851-1858
854 O'Kelly J, Spiers W (1992) Effect of monensin on methane and heat productions of
855 [Brahman] steers fed lucerne hay either *ad libitum* or at the rate of 250 g per hour.
856 Aust J Agr Res 43:1789-1793
857 Patra AK (2012) Enteric methane mitigation technologies for ruminant livestock: a
858 synthesis of current research and future directions. Environ Monit Assess 184:1929-
859 1952
860 Patra AK, Kamra DN, Bhar R, Kumar R, Agarwal N (2011) Effect of *Terminalia*
861 *chebula* and *Allium sativum* on *in vivo* methane emission by sheep. J Anim Physiol
862 Anim Nutr 95:187-191
863 Patra AK, Saxena J (2009a) Dietary phytochemicals as rumen modifiers: a review of the
864 effects on microbial populations. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 96:363–375

865 Patra AK, Saxena J (2009b) The effect and mode of action of saponins on the microbial
866 populations and fermentation in the rumen and ruminant production. Nutr Res Rev
867 22:204-219
868 Patra AK, Yu Z (2012) Effects of essential oils on methane production and fermentation
869 by, and abundance and diversity of, rumen microbial populations. Appl Environ
870 Microbiol 78:4271-4280
871 Perez AR, Beauchemin KA, Okine EK, Duval SM (2013) Effect of 3-nitrooxypropanol
872 on methane production using rumen simulation technique (Rusitec). Advances in
873 Animal Biosciences 4 (2) pp 389
874 Pfister P, Wasserfallen A, Stettler R, Leisinger T (1998) Molecular analysis of
875 *Methanobacterium* phage ΨM2. Mol Microbiol 30:233-244
876 Pinares-Patiño CS, Ebrahimi SH, McEwan JC, Dodds KG, Clark H, Luo D (2011) Is
877 rumen retention time implicated in sheep differences in methane emissions?
878 Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production 71:219–222
879 Pinares-Patiño CS, Ulyatt MJ, Lassey KR, Barry TN, Holmes CW (2003) Persistence of
880 differences between sheep in methane emission under generous grazing conditions.
881 J Agric Sci 140:227–233
882 Pope PB, Denman SE, Jones M, Tringe SG, Barry K, Malfatti SA, McHardy AC, Cheng
883 J.-F, Hugenholtz P, McSweeney CS, Morrison M (2010) Adaptation to herbivory by
884 the Tammar wallaby includes bacterial and glycoside hydrolase profiles different
885 from other herbivores. Proc Natl Academy Sci.107(33):14793-14798
886 Pope PB, Mackenzie Ak, Gregor I, Smith W, Sundset MA, McHardy AC, Morrison M,
887 Eijsink VGH (2012) Metagenomics of the Svalbard reindeer rumen microbiome
888 reveals abundance of polysaccharide utilization loci. PLoS ONE 7(6):e38571

889 Poulsen M, Schwab C, Jensen BB, Engberg RM, Spang A, Canibe N, Hojberg O,
890 Milinovich G, Fragner L, Schleper C, Weckwerth W, Lund P, Schramm A, Urich T
891 (2013) Methylotrophic methanogenic Thermoplasmata implicated in reduced
892 methane emission from bovine rumen. Nat Commun 4:1428
893 Qi M, Wang P, O'Toole N, Barboza PS, Ungerfeld E, Leigh MB, Selinger LB, Butler
894 G, Tsang A, McAllister TA, Forster RJ (2011). Snapshot of the eukaryotic gene
895 expression in muskoxen rumen- a metatranscriptomics approach. Plos One 6:e20521
896 Ramirez-Restrepo C, Barry T (2005) Alternative temperate forages containing
897 secondary compounds for improving sustainable productivity in grazing ruminants.
898 Anim Feed Sci Technol 120:179-201
899 Ross EM, Moate PJ, Bath CR, Davidson SE, Sawbridge TI, Guthridge KM, Cocks BG
900 and Hayes BJ (2012) High throughput whole rumen metagenome profiling using
901 untargeted massively parallel sequencing. BMC Genetics 13:53
902 Ross Em, Moate PJ, Marett L, Cocks BG, Hayes BJ (2013) Investigating the effect of
903 two methane-mitigating diets on the rumen microbiome using massively parallel
904 sequencing. J Dairy Sci 96: 6030-6046
905 Russell JB (2002) Rumen microbiology and its role in rumen nutrition, 1st edn. Russell,
906 Ithaca, New York
907 Scheehle EA, Kruger D (2006) Global anthropogenic methane and nitrous oxide
908 emissions. Energy J 22:33-44
909 Sharma A, Chaudhary PP, Sirohi SK, Saxena J (2011) Structure modeling and
910 prediction of NADP oxidoreducatse enzyme from *Methanobrevibacter smithii*.
911 Bioinformation 6:15-19.

912 Shin EC, Choi BR, Lim WJ, Hong SY, An CL, Cho KM, Kim YK, An JM, Kang JM,
913 Lee SS, Kim H, Yun HD (2004) Phylogenetic analysis of archaea in three
914 fractions of cow rumen based on the 16S rDNA sequence. Anareobe 10:313-319.
915 Singh KM, Ahir VB, Tripathi AK, Ramani, UV, Sajnani M, Koringa PG, Jakhesara SJ,
916 Pandya PR, Rank DN, Murty DS, Kothari RK, Joshi CG (2012a) Metagenomic
917 analysis of Surti buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*) rumen: a preliminary study. Mol Bio Rep
918 39:4841-4848
919 Singh KM, Jakhesara SJ, Koringa PG, Rank DN, Joshi CG (2012b) Metagenomic
920 analysis of virulence-associated and antibiotic resistance genes of microbes in
921 rumen of Indian buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*) Gene 506:146-151
922 Soliva CR, Meile L, Cieslak A, Kreuzer M, Machmuller A (2004) Rumen simulation
923 technique study on the interactions of dietary lauric and myristic acid
924 supplementation in suppressing ruminal methanogenesis. Br J Nutr 92:689-700
925 Staerfl SM, Zeitz JO, Kreuzer M, Soliva CR (2012) Methane conversion rate of bulls
926 fattened on grass or maize silage as compared with the IPCC default values, and the
927 long-term methane mitigation efficiency of adding acacia tannin, garlic, maca and
928 lupine. Agric Ecosys Environ 148:111–120
929 Stanton TB (2007) Prophage-like gene transfer agents: Novel mechanisms of gene
930 exchange for *Methanococcus*, *Desulfovibrio*, *Brachyspira*, and *Rhodobacter* species.
931 Anaerobe 13:43-49
932 Tajima K, Nagamine T, Matsui H, Nakamura M, Aminov RI (2001) Phylogenetic
933 anaylsis of archaeal 16S rRNA libraries from the rumen suggests the existence of a
934 novel group of archaea not associated with known methanogens. FEMS Microbiol
935 Lett 200:67-72

936 Tavendale MH, Meagher LP, Pacheco D, Walker N, Attwood GT, Sivakumaran S
937 (2005) Methane production from *in vitro* rumen incubations with *Lotus*
938 *pedunculatus* and *Medicago sativa*, and effects of extractable condensed tannin
939 fractions on methanogenesis. Anim Feed Sci Technol 123:403-419
940 Teather RM, Forster JR (1998) Manipulating the rumen microflora with bacteriocins to
941 improve ruminant production. Can J Anim Sci 78:57-69
942 Tejido ML, Ranilla MJ, García-Martínez R, Carro MD (2005) *In vitro* microbial growth
943 and rumen fermentation of different diets as affected by the addition of disodium
944 malate. Anim Sci 81:31-38
945 Tezel U, Pierson JA, Pavlostathis SG (2006) Fate and effect of quaternary ammonium
946 compounds on a mixed methanogenic culture. Water Res 40:3660-3668
947 Thorpe A (2009) Enteric fermentation and ruminant eructation: the role (and control?)
948 of methane in the climate change debate. Clim Change 93:407
949 Tiemann TT, Lascano CE, Kreuzer M, Hess HD (2008) The ruminal degradability of
950 fibre explains part of the low nutritional value and reduced methanogenesis in
951 highly tanniniferous tropical legumes. J Sci Food Agric 88:1794-1803
952 Ungerfeld E, Forster RJ (2011) A meta-analysis of malate effects on methanogenesis in
953 ruminal batch cultures. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166-167:282-290
954 Ungerfeld E, Kohn R, Wallace R, Newbold C (2007) A meta-analysis of fumarate
955 effects on methane production in ruminal batch cultures. J Anim Sci 85:2556-2563
956 Ungerfeld E, Rust SR, Broone DR, Liu Y (2004) Effects of several inhibitors on pure
957 cultures of ruminal methanogens. Appl Microbiol 97:520-526
958 Van Nevel C, Demeyer D (1996) Control of rumen methanogenesis. Environ Monit
959 Assess 42:73-97

960 Van Zijderveld SM, Fonken B, Dijkstra J, Gerrits WJ, Perdok HB, Fokkink W,
961 Newbold JR (2011) Effects of a combination of feed additives on methane
962 production, diet digestibility, and animal performance in lactating dairy cows. J
963 Dairy Sci 94:1445-1454
964 Waghorn G, Woodward S, Tavendale M, Clark D (2006) Inconsistencies in rumen
965 methane production-effects of forage composition and animal genotype, Elsevier, pp
966 115-118.
967 Wanapat M, Kongmun P, Poungchompu O, Cherdthong A, Khejornsart P, Pilajun R,
968 Kaenpakdee S (2012) Effects of plants containing secondary compounds and plant
969 oils on rumen fermentation and ecology. Trop Anim Health Pro 44:399-405
970 Wedlock D, Pedersen G, Denis M, Dey D, Janssen P, Buddle B (2010) Development of
971 a vaccine to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture: Vaccination of sheep
972 with methanogen fractions induces antibodies that block methane production *in*
973 *vitro*. New Zeal Vet J 58:29-36
974 Wedlock DN, Janssen PH, Leahy SC, Shu D, Buddle BM (2013) Progress in the
975 development of vaccines against rumen methanogens. Animal 7:244-252
976 Williams YJ, Popovski S, Rea SM, Skillman LC, Toovey AF, Northwood KS, Wright
977 AD (2009) A vaccine against rumen methanogens can alter the composition of
978 archaeal populations. Appl Environ Microbiol 75:1860-1866
979 Williams YJ, Rea SM, Popovski S, Pimm CL, Williams AJ, Toovey AF, Skillman LC,
980 Wright ADG (2008) Reponses of sheep to a vaccination of entodinial or mixed
981 rumen protozoal antigens to reduce rumen protozoal numbers. Br J Nutr 99:100-109

982 Wood T, Wallace R, Rowe A, Price J, Yáñez-Ruiz D, Murray P, Newbold C (2009)
983 Encapsulated fumaric acid as a feed ingredient to decrease ruminal methane
984 emissions. Anim Feed Sci Technol 152:62-71
985 Woodward S, Waghorn G, Ulyatt M, Lassey K (2001) Early indications that feeding
986 Lotus will reduce methane emissions from ruminants. New Zeal Soc Anim Pro
987 1999:23-26
988 Wright A, Kennedy P, O'Neill C, Toovey A, Popovski S, Rea S, Pimm C, Klein L
989 (2004) Reducing methane emissions in sheep by immunization against rumen
990 methanogens. Vaccine 22:3976-3985
991 Zhao S, Wang J, Bu D, Liu K, Zhu Y, Dog Z, Yu Z (2010) Novel glycoside hydrolases
992 identified by screening a chinese Holstein dairy cow rumen-derived metagenome
993 library. Appl Environ Microbiol 76:6701-6705
994 Zhou M, Hernandez-Sanabria E, Guan LL (2009) Assessment of the microbial ecology
995 of ruminal methanogens in cattle with different feed efficiencies. Appl Environ
996 Microbiol 75:6524-6533
997 Zhou X, Meile L, Kreuzer M, Zeitz JO (2013) The effect of lauric acid on methane
998 production and cell viability of *Methanobrevibacter ruminantium*. Adv Anim Biosci
999 4 (2):458
1000 Zhou YY, Mao HL, Jiang F, Wang JK, Liu JX, McSweeney CS (2011) Inhibition of
1001 rumen methanogenesis by tea saponins with reference to fermentation pattern and
1002 microbial communities in Hu sheep. Anim Feed Sci Technol 166:93-100

Table 1: Methane mitigation categories, mechanism of mitigation, problems associated and future directions

Mitigation categories	Subgroups	Example(s)	Mitigation mechanism (s)	Difficulties associated	Benefits and prospects	Reference(s)
i) Animal dietary manipulation	Manipulating animal diet composition	Shifting towards concentrate diets, use of newer forages	Improved passage rate of feed; increased propionate: acetate ratio; reduced rumen pH and protozoa counts	Shifting of methanogenesis towards hindgut; threat of rumen acidosis; economic losses in developing world	*In vivo* trails along with other strategies are essential	Niderkorn et al. (2011); Meale et al. (2012)
	Feed additives having secondary compounds	Condensed tannins, phenolic monomers, saponins, etc.	Inhibition of protozoa activity, fibre degraders and methanogenic archaea; decreased hydrogen availability	A few tannins lowers fibre digestibility; reduce palatability/ intake, performance, and change milk composition	Natural products; *In vivo* trials are needed for optimizing dose	Woodward et al. (2001); Carulla et al. (2005); Ramirez-Restrepo and Barry (2005); Tavendale et al. (2005); Hess et al. (2006); Animut et al. (2008); Tiemann et al. (2008); Lascano and Cárdenas (2010); Kamra et al. (2012)
	Feeding oils	Chain length (C_8-C_{16}) fatty acids	Having antimicrobial activities against methanogens and protozoa; biohydrogenation as a hydrogen sink; increased propionate: acetate ratio	Low palatability/ intake, animal performance, and changed milk composition; dose varies with diet and type of ruminant species	Continuing studies are must before making any conclusion	Machmuller and Kreuzer (1999); Dohme et al. (2000); Dohme et al. (2001); Soliva et al. (2004); Jordan et al. (2006a); Jordan et al. (2006b); Calsamiglia et al., (2007); Hook et al. (2010); Ding et al. (2012); Lunsin et al. (2012); Patra and Yu (2012)
	Addition of organic acids	Mainly fumaric and malic acids	Act as hydrogen sinks; shifting of rumen fermentation towards propionate formation	Contradictory reports; addition is affected by the type of diet; may increase rumen acidity; high cost	Screening of forages with higher organic acids content is desirable	Martin and Streeter (1995); Callaway et al. (1997); Carro et al. (1999); Carro and Ranilla (2003a,b) ; Ungerfeld et al. (2007); Wood et al. (2009); Foley et al. (2009a,b)

	Use of halogenated compounds	Chemicals like bromo alkyl sulphonates, lumazine, ethyl-2-butynoate, amichloral, cyclodextrin, lovatstain anthraquinone, etc. may be used	Inhibit protozoa, Gram-positive bacteria and methanogens; decrease substrate (s) for methanogenesis	Mostly *in vitro* reports; toxicity proven; transient effect due to adaptation of microflora and changes in diets	Combined administration is needed for constant results	Nevel and Demeyer (1995); May et al. (1995); Van Nevel and Demeyer (1996); McCrabb et al. (1997); Abecia et al. (2012)
	Role of ionophores	Mainly monensin, lasalocid, salinomycin, avoparcin, etc.	Eradicate methanogens; decrease substrate (s) for methanogenesis; inhibits protozoa and Gram-positive bacteria	No lasting effect; problem of absorption in rumen and reaching both in milk and meat; reduces intake	Further research required for a concrete solution	O'Kelly and Spiers (1992); Van Nevel and Demeyer (1996); Odongo et al. (2007); Hook et al. (2009)
ii) Rumen controls	By using bacteriocins	Bovicin HC5, Nisin	Aims at biological mitigation and hydrogen producers	Bacteriocins degradation; adaptation of rumen microbes; not target specific	More extensive research is required	Callaway et al. (1997); Teather and Forster (1998);
	Application of phage therapy	Appropriate phages for different groups of microbes	Should targets methanogens specifically	Host changes to avoid infections; specific phages	Regular change of phages and combination of phages can be tested	Pfister et al. (1998); Luo et al. (2001); Ackermann (2007); Ackermann and Kropinski (2007); Stanton, (2007); Attwood and McSweeney (2008); McAllister and Newbold (2008); Janssen and Kirs (2008)
	Through immunization	Development of relevant vaccines	Activates immune response of hosts against methanogens	Inadequate targets of vaccine due to differences in dietary regimen	Require genomic data for identifying universal immunization targets; *in vivo* efficacy tests yet not done	Wright et al (2004); Li et al. (2007); Cook et al. (2008); Williams et al. (2009); Zhou et al. (2009); Lascano and Cárdenas (2010); Wedlock et al. (2010)

	Via defaunation	Using chemical inhibitors; plant extracts, vaccines for protozoa	Reduces hydrogen	Transient effects; toxicity; reduced feed digestibility	Needs a validation before field application	Moss et al. (2000); Holtshausen et al. (2008); Morgavi et al. (2008);Williams et al. (2008); Patra and Saxena (2009); Bird et al. (2010); Hegarty et al. (2010)
	Using acetogens	Acetogenic microflora	Provide an alternative hydrogen sink	Needs high levels of hydrogen to grow at the rate of methanogens; unsure sustenance in rumen	Increases acetate, feeding experiments are must	Joblin (1999); Joblin (2005); Fonty et al. (2007)
	Feeding probiotics or direct-fed microbials	Yeasts (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*); fungi (*Aspergillus oryzae*, *Trichosporonseric eum*, etc.)	Increases butyrate or propionate and decreases protozoa; Enhances acetogenesis	Lowers rumen efficiency; *in vitro* reports for strain selection are erratic; Scanty *in vivo* experiments	Better hydrogen utilizing bacteria followed by *in vivo* study is desirable	Martin and Nisbet (1990); Carro et al. (1992); Mathieu et al. (1996); Newbold et al. (1998); Lynch and Martin (2002)
iii) Other systematic changes	Animal breed selection and intensiveness of production	Low producers of methane	Genetic and retention time based differences of animals	Affects digestibility; environmental impacts	Increased animal production	Pinares-Patiño et al. (2003); Pinares-patiño et al. (2011); Waghorn et al. (2006); Kumar et al. (2009); Lascano and Cárdenas (2010); Attwood et al. (2011)